Compendium of the history of doctrines.
230 H121c 120431

Hagenbach, Karl Rudolf,
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

230
H121c

Hagenbach, Karl Rudolf
Compendium of the history of doctrines

120431

DATE DUE

GAYLORD 234

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/compendiumofhist0000krha

COMPENDIUM

OF THE

HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

BY

K. R. HAGENBACH,

DR. AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BASLE.

VOLUME I.

TRANSLATED

BY CARL W. BUCH.

SECOND EDITION, MUCH IMPROVED.

2477

230
H124
C.1

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38. GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.;
SEELEY & CO.; WARD & CO.; JACKSON & WALFORD, &C.
DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON.
MDCCCL.

L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles 26, Calif.

EDINBURGH:
PRINTED BY JOHN THOMSON
1. MILNE SQUARE.]

1850

230
H

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

"The History of Doctrines" is a branch of theological science familiar to the German student, but as yet almost entirely unknown in this country. In most, if not in all German Universities, lectures on this subject are yearly delivered, and a number of compendiums of various merit have been published by different writers. The present publication was selected for translation by my esteemed tutor, *Dr. Davidson,* Professor of Biblical Literature in the Lancashire Independent College, because it was thought that the compendiousness and clearness of the work would contribute to render it acceptable to the English reader. Throughout it has been the Translator's aim, not so much to give a literal translation, as to adapt the original to English modes of thought, without however permitting himself in any case to alter the sense of the original. A few passages, which were found to be of such a nature as to convey little definite meaning in translation, have been omitted. How far the Translator has succeeded in accomplishing the end proposed, must be left to the decision of competent judges; he would, however, feel gratified in knowing that he has been permitted to do some service in the language of a country, among whose people he has met with so much that will ever be pleasant in his recollections.

It seems unnecessary that the Translator should say much about the department of science to which the present work belongs, about its nature, use, etc., since the introduction to the work itself will give all needful information. A "historical developement of the doctrines of Christianity" cannot fail to be regarded as highly interesting and instructive by every thinking mind, and especially by every divine who would not rest satisfied with the simple and unqualified reception of the peculiar doctrines of the creed adopted by his denomination. The knowledge of what the most eminent theologians of all ages have thought on points frequently the subjects of much controversy, will be found of special use to those who are desirous of taking any part in such controversies.

The Author of the present work is Professor of Theology in the university of Basle, and belongs to the orthodox school of Germany. He observes, however, himself: "*Respecting my theological views, I do not think it necessary to enter into any lengthened remarks, inasmuch as they will be clear from the work itself to such an extent as is allowable in a writing of a professedly historical character, in which the subjective opinions of the writer should neither be prominently brought forward at the expense of truth, nor wholly kept back at the expense of liberty.*" (Extract from the Author's preface.) It may be sufficient to add, that Professor Hagenbach enjoys a high and deserved reputation in his own country as a theological writer.

The English reader will probably regret that the Author should have paid so little attention to English theology; but English theology is not much studied in Germany, nor does the English language possess works on the History of Doctrines. The Translator has endeavoured to supply this defect by adding references to such works as he thought would be most useful and accessible to the English reader. These references and other notes are included in brackets [ ].

The sign † before the name of an author shows that he is a Roman Catholic writer; the sign * signifies that his work is deserving of special notice.

In conclusion, the Translator takes this opportunity of expressing his best thanks to his friend and fellow-student, *R. A. Vaughan, B. A.*, for his kind assistance in preparing the MSS., and to *Dr. Davidson* for the aid which he has afforded him.

CARL W. BUCH.

Lancashire Independent College,
August 12th, 1846.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE

SECOND EDITION OF THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION.

VOLUME I.

The Editor of this edition of the translation of HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES, believes that it may be well to inform the readers of this work in what respects this edition differs from the former which appeared in 1846.

The especial difference consists in its having been compared by the Translator, Mr. BUCH, with the second and greatly improved edition of the German original; this has afforded the opportunity for introducing many of those improvements which Dr. Hagenbach considers to be of especial importance,—so much so, that the author laments, in the preface to his second edition, that Mr. Buch was unable to use that edition as the basis of his translation: he says of Mr. Buch's version: "An English translation of the first edition (published as the third volume of Clark's Foreign Theological Library, Edinburgh, 1846,) executed by C. W. BUCH, has reached me as a friendly present, for which I return my public thanks to the Translator, and only lament that it was out of his power to use this second edition as the text of his version."

The principal additions made by Dr. Hagenbach in his second edition are derived, he says, from works on the history of doctrines which had been published since the appearance of his first edition. We have not thought it needful to specify these, as the works cited are constantly mentioned throughout this volume.

Mr. Buch left England after he had prepared this volume for the press, and, in consequence, it has thus been placed in the hands of the present Editor, whose responsibility has not been great.

In carrying the work through the press, the original has been used continually for reference; and it has appeared to the Editor that the Translator has manifested considerable judgment in the selection which he has made from amongst the Author's additions. Although the Editor has not professedly revised the translation, yet the continual comparison with the original has often suggested slight corrections; these have mostly been found in cases in which some technical expression, or theological term, was so translated as to give a rendering of the German rather than the exact phrase to which we are accustomed in English in order to express the idea: there have been other minor corrections of the Editor's which he does not consider necessary to particularize; for these alterations neither are nor pretend to be a revision of Mr. Buch's satisfactory translation.

The *use* of such a work does not depend on the sentiments of the author, so long as he faithfully delivers the opinions of the writers who have lived from age to age: there is, however, but little in Dr. Hagenbach's expression of his own sentiments on which the Editor would be even inclined to remark. Perhaps, however, it sometimes seems as though a doctrine were brought forward as something *new*, when the only novelty consists in the fact, that definite statements are found on subjects never before denied; and these statements are only the very words or the very ideas of scripture. No developement of *true* doctrine can ever add to what God has *previously* given in Holy Scripture; but when fundamental truths of the Christian religion (*e. g.* the Trinity in whose name we are baptised,—the Godhead and manhood of the Lord Jesus Christ) are *denied*, then accurate definitions become needful, which previously had not been required.

It may also be remarked, that it is easy to suppose that writers express inconsistent or contradictory views, when, in fact, they only state the different aspects in which the Scripture presents the subject; as an instance, we may refer to the sentiments of Irenæus relative to the Holy Ghost: there is no contradiction in his speaking of the Holy Ghost, as properly God, and his also mentioning him as a gift bestowed by God.

The Editor perfectly agrees with Mr. Buch, that the History of Doctrines, as such, has not engaged the attention of writers in this country. We have commonly had the subject treated as a part of church history, or else in systematic statements of doctrine (such as the admirable and orthodox work of Bishop Pearson on the Creed), the controversies on each point are treated of separately—both modes of studying the subject have their advantages; the historic mode has this to recommend it, that it takes the mind away from mere crudities of statement, and leads it into an apprehension *how* opinions were formed, and in what connections they were held.

The importance of this subject to theological students is most obvious; how often do we find some repulsive theory brought forward which strikes many as novel? the historical theologian, however, can immediately detect its fallacy, and can show how such sentiments were advanced in former ages, how true Evangelic doctrine meets them, and how Holy Scripture ("the testimony of the Holy Ghost") refutes them. Thus will the History of Doctrines be found an important handmaid to every really considerate Biblical student.

S. P. T.

March 12, 1850.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Page
§ 1. Definition 1
2. The Relation of the History of Doctrines to Ecclesiastical History and Dogmatic Theology . . 4
3. Relation to Biblical Theology . . . 4
4. Relation to Symbolism . . . 5
5. Relation to Patristics . . . 7
6. Relation to the History of Heresies and the History of Universal Religion 8
7. Relation to the History of Philosophy, the History of Christian Ethics, and the History of Dogmatic Theology . 10
8. Auxiliary Sciences 11
9. Importance of the History of Doctrines . . 12
10. Scientific Treatment of the History of Doctrines . 13
11. Arrangement 14
12. Division into Periods 14
13. Sources of the History of Doctrines: *a* Public sources . 19
14. *b* Private sources . 21
15. *c* Indirect sources . 25
16. Compendiums 25

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM THE APOSTOLIC AGE TO THE DEATH OF ORIGEN, OR FROM THE YEAR 80—254.

THE AGE OF APOLOGETICS.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIRST PERIOD.

§ 17. Christ and Christianity . . . 32
18. The Apostles 35
19. Civilization of the Age, and Philosophy . . 38
20. Rule of Faith. The Apostles' Creed . . 40

Page
§ 21. Heresies 41
22. Judaism and Ethnicism . . . 44
23. Ebionites and Cerinthus. Docetæ and Gnostics . 44
24. Montanism and Earliest Monarchianism . . 49
25. The Catholic Doctrine . . . 52
26. The Theology of the Fathers . . . 54
27. The general Dogmatic Character of this Period . . 64

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIRST PERIOD.

FIRST SECTION.

APOLOGETICO-DOGMATIC PROLEGOMENA: EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY. REVELATION AND SOURCES OF REVELATION. SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

§ 28. Truth and Divinity of the Christian Religion in general 65
29. Mode of Argument 68
30. Sources of Knowledge . . . 74
31. Canon of the Sacred Scriptures . . 75
32. Inspiration of the Scriptures . . . 79
33. Biblical Interpretation , . . 85
34. Tradition 89

SECOND SECTION.

THEOLOGY: THE DOCTRINE OF GOD (INCLUDING THE DOCTRINE RESPECTING THE CREATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD, THE DOCTRINE OF ANGELS AND OF DEMONS.)

§ 35. The Existence of God . . . 94
36. The Unity of God 98
37. God as a Being that may be Comprehended, Known and Named 100
38. Idealism and Anthropomorphism. Corporeity of God . 103
39. The Attributes of God . . . 107
40. The Doctrine of the Logos. *a* Traces of it in the Period before the Christian Era, and in Jewish and Gentile Systems of Religion and Philosophy. . . 111
41. *b* The Christian Doctrine of the Logos, as represented in the Writings of John . . 115
42. *c* The Theologumenon of the Church concerning the Logos to the times of Origen . . 116
43. *d* Identification of the Terms Logos and the Son of God by Origen 122
44. The Holy Ghost 124

Page
45. Doctrine of the Trinity 128
46. Monarchianism and Subordination . . . 129
47. Doctrine of the Creation of the World . . 133
48. Providence and Government of the World . . 136
49. Angelology and Demonology 139
50. The Angels 140
51. Satan and Demons 144
52. The same subject continued 147

THIRD SECTION.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 53. Introduction 151
54. Division of Man and Practical Psychology . . 152
55. Origin of the Soul 154
56. The Image of God 156
57. Liberty and Immortality. *a.* Liberty . . 159
58. *b.* Immortality . . 162
59. On Sin, the Fall of the First Man and its consequences 164
60. On the Doctrine of Sin in general . . . 166
61. Interpretation of the Narrative of the Fall . . 168
62. State of Innocence and Fall 169
63. The Effects of the Fall 171

FOURTH SECTION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY.

§ 64. On Christology in general 176
65. The Godman 177
66. Further Developement of this Doctrine . . 181
67. The Sinlessness of Christ 186
68. On Redemption and Atonement . . . 188
69. Descensus ad Inferos 195
70. The Economy of Redemption . . . 196

FIFTH SECTION.

THE CHURCH AND HER MEANS OF GRACE.

§ 71. The Church 202
72. Baptism 207

Page
§ 73. The Lord's Supper 214
74. Definition of the Term Sacrament . . 223

SIXTH SECTION.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS.—(ESCHATOLOGY.)

§ 75. The Second Advent of Christ.—Millennarianism (Chiliasm) 225
76. The Resurrection . . . 229
77. General Judgment.—Hades.—Purgatory.—Conflagration of the World 234
78. State of the Blessed and the Damned.—Restitution of all Things 237

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM THE DEATH OF ORIGEN TO JOHN DAMASCENUS, FROM THE YEAR 254—730.

THE AGE OF POLEMICS.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE SECOND PERIOD.

§ 79. Introduction 243
80. Doctrinal Definitions and Controversies . . 244
81. The Dogmatic Character of this Period.—The Fate of Origenism 245
82. Theologians of this Period . . . 245
83. The Eastern Church from the Fourth to the Sixth Century. —(The Schools of Alexandria and Antioch) . 254
84. The Western Church.—Augustinism . . 255
85. The Heresies 256
86. Division of the Material . . . 258

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE SECOND PERIOD.

FIRST CLASS.

THE CONTEST BETWEEN ORTHODOXY AND HERESY

(POLEMICAL PART.)

FIRST DIVISION.

DOCTRINES RESPECTING THEOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY.

a. THEOLOGY PROPER.

§ 87. The relation of the Father to the Son.—Lactantius, Dionysius of Alexandria, and the followers of Origen . . 259

Page
§ 88. The same subject continued.—The Theories of Sabellius and Paul of Samosata 262
89. The same subject continued.—Arianism . . 263
90. The same subject continued.—The Doctrine of the Council of Nice 267
91. The some subject continued.—Further fluctuations until the Synod of Constantinople 269
92. An Inquiry into the Nature of the Causes which gave rise to the aforesaid fluctuations.—Marcellus and Photinus 272
93. The Divinity of the Holy Spirit . . . 276
94. Procession of the Holy Spirit . . . 281
95. The Doctrine of the Trinity concluded . . 284
96. Tritheism, Tetratheism 287
97. Symbolum Quicumque 288

b CHRISTOLOGY.

§ 98. The True Humanity of Christ.—Traces of Docetism.—Arianism 291
99. The Doctrine of Apollinaris 293
100. The Doctrine of Nestorius 295
101. Eutychian-Monophysite Controversy . . 298
102. Progress of the Controversy.—Theopaschitism . 301
103. Various Features of the Monophysite Doctrine.—Aphthardocetæ, Phthartolatri, Agnoetæ . . . 303
104. The Doctrine of Two Wills in Christ.—Monothelites 304
105. Practico-religious importance of Christology during this Period 307

SECOND DIVISION.

DOCTRINES RESPECTING ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 106. On Man in general 307
107. On the Doctrine of Sin in general . . . 312
108. Consequences of the first Sin, and freedom of the Will (according to the Theologians of the Greek Church) . 315
109. The Opinions of the Western Theologians previous to the time of Augustine, and of Augustine himself previous to the Pelagian Controversy 317
110. The Pelagian Controversy 319
111. First Point of Controversy; Sin, Original Sin, and its consequences 322
112. Second Point of Controversy: Liberty and Grace . 325
113. Third Point of Controversy: Predestination . 327
114. Semipelagianism and the later Fathers of the Church 329

SECOND CLASS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DOCTRINES WHICH HAVE EITHER NO CONNECTION, OR BUT A REMOTE ONE, WITH THE HERESIES OF THE AGE.

Page
§ 115. (Introduction) 334
116. The idea of Religion and Revelation . . 335

1. *Prolegomena.*

§ 117. Apologetical Writings in defence of Christianity . 337
118. Miracles and Prophecy 338
119. Sources of Religious Knowledge. Bible and Tradition 340
120. The Canon 341
121. Inspiration and Interpretation . . . 343
122. Tradition and the Continuance of Inspiration . 348

2. *The Doctrine concerning God.*

§ 123. The Existence of God 349
124. The Nature of God 353
125. The Unity of God 356
126. The Attributes of God 357
127. Creation 359
128. The relation of the Doctrine of Creation to the Doctrine of the Trinity 361
129. Design of the Universe—Providence—Preservation and Government of the World 361
130. Theodicy 364
131. Angelology and Angelolatry 366
132. The same subject continued . . . 370
133. Devil and Demons 371

3. *Soteriology.*

§ 134. Redemption through Christ . . . 375

4. *The Church and Her Means of Grace.*

§ 135. The Doctrine of the Church 382
136. The Sacraments 385
137. Baptism 386
138. The Lord's Supper 393

5. *The Doctrine of the Last Things.*

§ 139. Millennarianism.—The Kingdom of Christ . . 398
140. The Resurrection of the Body . . . 400
141. General Judgment.—Conflagration of the World.—Purgatory 405
142. The State of the Blessed and the Damned . 408

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM JOHN DAMASCENUS TO THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION, FROM THE YEAR 730—1517.

THE AGE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

(SCHOLASTICISM IN THE WIDEST SENSE OF THE WORD.)

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE THIRD PERIOD.

Page
§ 143. Character of this Period 415
144. The relation of the Systematical tendency to the Apologetical 416
145. The Polemics of this Period.—Controversies with Heretics 418
146. The Greek Church 419
147. The Western Church 421
148. The Age of the Carlovingians . . . 422
149. Scholasticism in general 424
150. The Principal Scholastic Systems.—*a*. 1. Period of Scholasticism to the Time of Peter Lombard . . 427
151. *b*. II. Period to the end of the Thirteenth Century . 431
152. *c*. III. Period.—The Decline of Scholasticism in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries . . . 435
153. Mysticism. 437
154. Scientific Opposition made to Scholasticism . . 443
155. Practical Opposition.—The Forerunners of the Reformation 445
156. The Connection between the History of Doctrines and the History both of the Church and the World during the present Period 447

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE THIRD PERIOD.

FIRST SECTION.

APOLOGETICO-DOGMATIC PROLEGOMENA.

RUTH OF CHRISTIANITY.—RELATION BETWEEN REASON AND REVELATION.—SOURCES OF REVELATION.—SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

157. Truth and Divine Origin of Christianity . . 450
158. Reason and Revelation, Faith and Knowledge, . 452
159. Sources of Knowledge.—Bible and Tradition . 458
160. The Canon of the Bible and Biblical Criticism . 461
161. Inspiration 462
162. Interpretation of Scripture—Extent of the perusal of the Bible 466

SECOND SECTION.

THEOLOGY.

(INCLUSIVE OF COSMOLOGY, ANGELOLOGY, DEMONOLOGY, ETC.)

Page
§ 163. The Existence of God 471
164. God as a Being which may be Comprehended . 478
165. The Nature of God in general. (Pantheism and Theism.) 483
166. The Attributes of God.—*a.* The Relation of God to Time, Space, and Number. (The Omnipresence, Eternity, and Unity of God) 487
167. *b.* The Relation of God to Existence.—Omnipotence and Omniscience 491
168. *c.* Moral Attributes 497
169. Procession of the Holy Spirit . . . 498
170. The Doctrine of the Trinity . . . 502
171. The Doctrine of Creation, Providence, and the Government of the World—Theodicy . . . 518
172. The Angels and the Devil 524

INTRODUCTION.

Comp. *Hagenbach*, Encyclopædie, 240, ss. [*Pelt*, Theologische Encyclop. p. 313, ss.] *Kliefoth, Th.* Einleitung in die Dogmengeschichte, Parchim 1839.]

§ 1.

DEFINITION.

The *History of Doctrines* (history of opinions, Dogmengeschichte) (1) is that branch of theological science which exhibits the gradual developement of the doctrines (dogmas) (2) of the Christian church, the various aspects they have assumed in the course of time, and the changes they have undergone through the influence of civilization in different ages of the world. (3)

(1) [*Kitto* (Cyclopædia of Bibl. Literat. vol. i. pref. p. xiii.) proposes the term *Doctrine History*, "*since we have no corresponding term in the English language.*" *Dr. Credner* gives the following definition of the history of doctrines (*Kitto*, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. pref. p. xiii.): Doctrine History in a less limited sense than that in which the term is usually taken, points out the peculiar doctrines which have, from time to time, been received as articles of Christian belief. But as a variety of opinions with regard to the essentials of the Christian religion has arisen, not only among the various and different sects as separate bodies; but likewise at sundry times among the members of even one and the same sect or party, Doctrine History must necessarily include all the peculiar features of schismatic views, their origin and history, the causes of their rise and gradual developement, as well as their connection with the Scriptures, from which they all claim to be derived, and by which they must be tried. Comp.

also *Tholuck*, Theolog. Encyclop. and Methodol. transl. by Prof. Park, in Bibliotheca Sacra, vol. i. 1844, p. 556: It (the history of doctrines) exhibits to us the processes of thought, in which the scientific men of different ages have endeavoured to apprehend and to vindicate the doctrines of Christianity.]

2. On the meaning of the word δόγμα (statutum, decretum, præceptum, placitum) v. *Suicer*, Thesaurus sub voce. *Münscher*, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, edit. by *von Cölln*, p. 1. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengesch. p. 1. *Augusti*, Dogmengeschichte, § 1. *Klee*, Dogmengeschichte, Prolegomena. *Nitzsch*, System der christlichen Lehre, 5th edit. p. 50-52. *Hagenbach*, Encycl. p. 241. [*Knapp*, Lectures on Christian Theology, transl. by L. Woods, Lond. 1843, p. 24. *Credner* in Kitto, l. c. p. xiii.: A *dogma* is understood to be the doctrine of a particular party or sect, etc.] The word δόγμα signifies in the first place: *decree*, edict, statute. Comp. (Sept. vers.) Dan. ii. 13; vi. 8. Esth. iii. 9. 2 Macc. x. 2; and in the New Testament Luke ii. 1, (where it has a political sense only), Acts xvi. 4, (used in a theological sense, denoting the apostolical decrees to the gentile Christians), Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14, (in the latter passage it is also used in a theological sense, but has no reference to *Christian* belief and *Christian* doctrine, as some think; it rather relates to Jewish ordinances; comp. *Winer*, Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms, 5th ed. 1836, p. 250.) Its use in the sense of doctrine, or gospel cannot be established from any passage in the N. T.; the words employed to express this idea, are: εὐαγγέλιον, κήρυγμα, λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, etc. In the writings of the Stoics δόγμα, (decretum, placitum,) signifies: *theoretical principle.* Marcus Aurelius εἰς ἑαυτ. 2, 3: Ταῦτά σοὶ ἀρκέτω, ἀεὶ δόγματα ἔστω. Cic. Acad. quaest. iv. 9: Sapientia neque de se ipsa dubitare debet, neque de suis decretis quæ philosophi vocant δόγματα. The Fathers adopted similar language, and taking the word δόγμα (to which the predicate τὸ θεῖον was sometimes applied) in a more comprehensive sense, understood it to imply all that is contained in the doctrines. The passages from Ignatius, Clement of Alex. (Paed. I. 1. Strom. viii. p. 924, edit. of Potter), Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, etc. are given by *Suicer*, Thes. sub voce. They also used it in reference to the opinions of heretics, with the epithet μυσαρά, or others of similar import, but not so frequently as the terms δόξαι, νοήματα, comp. *Klee*, l. c. *Cyrill of Jerusalem*, (Cat.

4, 2.) makes a distinction between doctrines and ethics, and understands by δόγμα that which relates to *faith*, by πρᾶξις that which refers to moral actions: Ὁ τῆς θεοσεβείας τρόπος ἐκ δύο τούτων συνέστηκε, δογμάτων εὐσεβῶν καὶ πράξεων ἀγαθῶν. The former are the source of the latter. We meet with similar expressions in the writings of Seneca; he describes the *dogmas* as the elements of which the body of wisdom is composed, as the seat of life, Ep. 94, 95. A peculiar and most curious definition of the word δόγμα is given by *Basil* de Spiritu S. c. 27: Ἄλλο γὰρ δόγμα καὶ ἄλλο κήρυγμα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ σιωπᾶται, τὰ δὲ κηρύγματα δημοσιεύεται (esoteric and exoteric doctrine.) According to Nitzsch, it was only in consequence of the representations of *Döderlein*, that many writers explained δόγμα to mean *Sententia doctoris alicujus* rather than *ipsa doctrina*, doctrinal *opinion* rather than doctrinal *idea*. The definition of the history of doctrines, its importance, and the mode of its treatment, are closely connected with the above definition of the term δόγμα. In the one case, the history of doctrines will be considered as nothing but a collection of fanciful notions and opinions, which owes its existence to chance; in the other, it will be regarded as the organic developement of a vital principle, whose seeds already exist, (comp. § 10.)

(3) It is necessary here to guard against a twofold error. There are some who perceive in every new mode of representing Divine truth, in every change of phraseology, an alteration or corruption of the doctrine of the church; they erroneously suppose, that none but biblical terms are to be introduced into dogmatic theology, and would make the history of doctrines a mere history of corruptions. There are others who will admit nothing but a progressive developement of the true doctrine within the pale of the church, and seem to forget, that disorders and diseases often make their appearance in a strong and healthy body. True science has to consider both these conditions; religion, too, advances, comes to a stand, and goes back; it has its excellencies and its defects, its stages of purity, and its stages of corruption. (Thus it would be incorrect to reject the doctrine of the Trinity, of original sin, the sacraments, etc. because those terms themselves are not used in Scripture; but it is our duty to examine whether any thing extraneous has been mixed up with them, and how far the developement of a doctrine may become dangerous to the truth of the gospel.)

§ 2.

THE RELATION OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES TO ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, AND DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

The history of doctrines properly constitutes a part of ecclesiastical history, [Church History, *Credner* in Kitto, l. c. p. xvii.], but is now separated from it on account of its wide extent, and treated as a particular science.⁽¹⁾ The history of doctrines further forms the transition from ecclesiastical history to dogmatic theology properly so called.⁽²⁾

(1) Comp. § 16. and *Hagenbach,* Encyclop. p. 242. " *Whether we consider the history of doctrines as a separate branch of theological science, or regard it as a part of ecclesiastical history, is in itself indifferent; and the distinction, if there be any. is merely nominal. For apart from the difference of extent which depends on external relations, the subject of investigation is the same in both cases, only under various aspects. The subject of the history of doctrines, properly so called, is the dogma as it presents itself in the various stages of its developement; that of ecclesiastical history, is the dogma in its relation to external circumstances.*" *Hase,* Kirchengeschichte, pref. p. iv. v.

(2) Many think that the history of doctrines is a kind of *appendix* to dogmatic theology, rather than an *introduction* to it; but this opinion is erroneous, and appears to arise both from incorrect views on the nature of dogmatic theology, and from a misapprehension of its historical character; (one sided conception of dogmatic theology, either from the biblical, or from the speculative point of view.) The history of doctrines forms the point of connection between historical theology on the one hand, and didactic (systematic) theology on the other. Ecclesiastical history is its foundation, dogmatic theology, both of the present and the future, is the subject of its researches.

§ 3.

RELATION TO BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

The history of doctrines presupposes biblical theology (and the theology of the N. T. in particular) as its basis; in like manner the general history of the church presupposes the life of Christ and the apostolic age.

Those writers who reduce theology in general to *biblical* theology, and exclude dogmatic theology altogether, consistently look upon the history of doctrines as a mere appendix to biblical theology. But in our opinion biblical theology is only to be regarded as the *foundation-stone* of the edifice; the history of doctrines as the historian of its *progressive construction;* and dogmatic theology as the builder, who is still engaged in its *completion.* It is no more the object of doctrine history fully to expound all the doctrines of the Bible, than of ecclesiastical history to give a complete account of the life of Christ and his Apostles. But as the history of primitive Christianity is the only solid foundation and starting-point of church history, so the history of doctrines must rest upon, and begin with the theology of both the New and Old Testaments.

§ 4.

RELATION TO SYMBOLISM.

The history of doctrines takes in the *Symbolism*[a](1) of the church, since it must have respect not only to the general formation and import of public confessions of faith,(2) but also to the distinguishing principles set forth in them.(3) Symbolism may however be separated from the history of doctrines, and treated as comparative dogmatic theology. It stands in the same relation to the history of doctrines, as the church statistics, [comp. *Credner* in Kitto, l. c. p. xvii.], of any particular period stand to ecclesiastical history in general.

---

[a] [Comp. *Credner* in Kitto, l. c. p. xiii. *Pelt*, Theol. Encyclop. p. 448. defines Symbolism as that branch of theological science, which considers the distinguishing principles of the various sections of the Christian church.]

(1) On the sense in which the church uses the term σύμβολον comp. *Suicer*, Thesaurus p. 1084. *Creuzer*, Symbolik, § 16. *Marheineke*, christliche Symbolik, vol. i. towards the beginning. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, i. part 2. p. 536, ss. [*Pelt*, Theol. Encyclop. p. 456. Maximus Taurinensis (about the year 460), says in Hom. in Symb. p. 239: Symbolum tessera est et signaculum, quo inter fideles perfidosque secernitur.] By *symbols* (in the doctrinal sense of the word, but neither in its liturgical, nor technical sense) we understand the public confessions of faith by which those belonging to the same section of the church recognise each other, as soldiers by the watch-word (tessera militaris.)

(2) The *earlier symbols* of the church (*e. g.* the creed commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds), may be called the Shibboleth (Judg. xii. 6.) of the Catholic church, by which she was distinguished from all heretics. It is evident that these symbols are deserving of special consideration in the history of doctrines. They are in relation to the private opinions of individual ecclesiastical writers, what systems of mountains are in relation to the hills and valleys of a country. They are as it were the watch-towers from which we can survey the entire field of observation, the principal stations in the pursuit of the study of the history of doctrines, and cannot therefore be separated from, nor considered out of their connection with other sciences.

(3) Since the age of the Reformation the symbols are in relation to Protestants, what they formerly were in relation to heretical sects—the barrier which the ancient church erected in opposition to all who held other than orthodox views. On the other hand, the Protestants were naturally led, in a similar manner, to set forth their own distinguishing principles. Their confessions of faith had, moreover, regard to the differences which had arisen out of controversies within the pale of the Protestant church herself (Lutherans and Calvinists), and to other opinions more or less at variance with those held by the orthodox party, (Anabaptists, Unitarians, and others.) And lastly, the Roman Catholics found it necessary to exhibit the doctrines of their church in new confessions of faith. These and other circumstances made it desirable that a separate theological science should be formed, whose special object it should be to consider the distinguishing principles before mentioned. It became first known

under the name Elenchtik or Polemics, which was afterwards changed into that of *Symbolism.* (This latter name has not so much reference to the struggle, which had been carried on between the different parties in the church, as to the historical knowledge of the points at issue, and the nature of that struggle.)[b]

§ 5.

RELATION TO PATRISTICS.

Inasmuch as the history of the dogma in its relation to the church is the primary object of doctrine history, the private opinions of ecclesiastical writers will come before us only when these writers either exerted, or endeavoured to exert some real influence upon the form of belief adopted by the church. The full investigation however of the literary character and history of the fathers, as well as of their doctrinal opinions, and the influence which the latter had upon the former, must be left to that particular science which is called *Patristics* (Patrology.)

On the definition of the term Patristics, comp. *Hagenbach,* Encyclopaedie, p. 248, ss.; the idea conveyed by it is by no means definite and clear.[c] But even if we enlarge it, so as to make it embrace not only the Fathers of the first six centuries, but all who have been of some standing in the church, either as founders of new systems or as reformers, (comp. Möhler, p. 20): it is evident that a great deal of what is contained in the writings of the Fathers must be introduced into the history of doctrines. The very study of the sources leads to the examination of their works. But we would not maintain, as Baumgarten-Crusius does, (Dogmengeschichte, p. 12.) that the history of doctrines already includes the most *essential* parts of the science in question; the relations and interests of individuals, which constitute what may be called the *essential* part, the characteristic feature of Patristics, have either none but a subordinate, or no place at all in the history of doctrines. Thus the object of the one is to know the *system* of Augustine, of the other (Patristics) to know the history of his *person*. Concerning the literat. comp. § 14.

---

[b] *Sack,* however, has recently published a work on Polemics (christliche Polemik, Hamburgh 1838.) as a distinct science.

[c] The distinction made by some writers, and Roman Catholics in particular, between Patristics and Patrology, (v. *Möhler,* Patrologie, p. 14.) appears to us on the whole unfounded. [Comp. however, *Credner* in Kitto l. c. p. xiv., where the same distinction is made.]

§ 6.

RELATION TO THE HISTORY OF HERESIES AND THE HISTORY OF UNIVERSAL RELIGION.

The history of doctrines considers the opinions of heretics only as they represent any particular tendency of the theological mind, or by way of contrast set the doctrines of the church in a clearer light.(1) Those who wish more fully to investigate the internal character of heretical systems, will obtain the desired information either in the *history of heresies*(2) properly so called, or in the history of universal religion. Neither is it the object of the history of doctrines to discuss the relation between Christianity, and other forms of religion. On the contrary, it presupposes the history of comparative religion, in the same manner as dogmatic theology presupposes *apologetic theology*. [Comp. *Credner* in Kitto, l. c. p. xvii. *Tholuck* in Bibliotheca Sacra, i. p. 556: " This term has ordinarily been employed to denote the science which exhibits the historical grounds for the truth, and the divine authority of Christianity," i.q. Evidences of Christianity. *Pelt*, l. c. p. 375, 377.][3]

---

[1] In the ecclesiastical point of view, the history of heresies may be compared to pathology, the history of doctrines to physiology. We do not, however, mean to say that every heretical tendency is in itself a state of disease, and full health only to be found in the definitions of ecclesiastical orthodoxy. On the contrary, it has been justly observed, that diseases frequently are natural transitions from a lower to a higher stage of life, and that a state of relative health is often brought about by antecedent diseases. Comp. *Schenkel*, das Wesen des Protestantismus (Schaffh. 1845.) I. p. 13. *Baur*, die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit, I. p. 112.

[2] The *term:* history of heresies, is seldom used in modern works, but the science to which it is applied, continues to form a distinct branch of theology. The very able publications of recent writers on the Gnostic systems, Ebionitism, Manichæism, Unitarianism, etc., and the lives of some of the Fathers, are of great use to the historian of Christian doctrines; but he cannot be expected to incorporate all the materials thus furnished into the history of doctrines. It is necessary that we should possess some knowledge, *e. g.* of the Gnostic and Ebionitic tendencies, because orthodoxy was in danger of being corrupted by them; but they would not come into consideration, if they did not differ from the orthodox belief. Their *internal* history must be treated on its own grounds. Nor is the history of doctrines the proper place to enter into a minute examination of the systems of Basilides and Valentinus; it suffices to have a clear and distinct idea of the points of contrast between the emanation-theory of the Gnostics, and the monotheistic theology of the church. In the same manner Nestorianism and Monophysitism are of importance in the controversies respecting the person of Christ in the second period. But after they had been combated by the Catholic Church, and had given rise to sects which, in consequence of further conflicts, were themselves divided into various parties, it can be no longer the task of the history of doctrines to consider the further developement of those controversies.

[3] The notions of Jewish sects, the myths and symbols of polytheistic religions, the systems of Mohammed, of Buddha, etc.,

are still more foreign to the history of Christian doctrines, than the heresies of the church. *Works of reference: Creuzer*, Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker, Darmstadt, 1819-23, 6 vols. *Stuhr*, allgemeine Geschichte der Religionsformen der heidnischen Völker: 1. die Religionssysteme der heidnischen Völker des Orients. Berlin 1836. 2. die Religionssysteme der Hellenen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung bis auf die macedonische Zeit. Berlin 1838. *Grimm, T.* deutsche Mythologie, Göttingen 1835. *Görres*, Mythengeschichte der Asiatischen Völker. *Richter*, Phantasien des Orients. [*Bryant*, Ancient Mythology, London 1807, 6 vols. 8vo.] *Eckermann, Dr. K.* Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte und Mythologie der vorzüglichsten Völker des Alterthums, nach der Anordnung von Ottfr. Müller. Halle 1845. 2 vols.

§ 7.

RELATION TO THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY, THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS, AND THE HISTORY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

Although the history of doctrines has some topics in common with the history of philosophy,(1) yet they are no more to be confounded with each other, than dogmatic theology and philosophy. The history of doctrines should also be separated from the history of Christian ethics, inasmuch as dogmatic theology and ethics themselves have been separated.(2) And, lastly, the history of dogmatic theology forms a part only of the history of doctrines.(3)

(1) This is the case, *e. g.* with the opinions of the Alexandrian school, the Gnostics, the scholastic divines, and of modern philosophical schools. Yet the object of the history of philosophy is distinct from that of the history of doctrines. Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, i. p. 8. *Works of reference: Brucker, J.* Historia critica philosophiae, Lips. 1742-44, 5 vols. 4to. 2d edit. 1766, 67. 6 vols. 4to. [The History of Philosophy drawn up from Brucker's Hist. Crit. Philos. by *William Enfield*, Lond. 1819. 2 vols.] *Ten-*

nemann, W. G. Geschichte der Philosophie, Leipzig 1798–1819, 11 vols. [The "Lehrbuch" of the same author was translated into English under the title: A Manual of the History of Philosophy, translated from the German, by the Rev. *Arthur Johnson,* Oxf. 1832.] *Reinhold, E.* Geschichte der Philosophie, Jena, 1845. 3d edit. 2 vols. *Ritter, H.* Geschichte der Philosophie, Hamburg, 1829-34. 4 vols. [Translated into English, by *Alex. J. W. Morrison,* Oxf. 1838—39. 3 vols. 8vo.] *Fries,* Geschichte der Philosophie, I. Halle, 1837. *Schleiermacher,* Geschichte der Philosophie, edit. by *H. Ritter.* (Complete works, iv. 1.) Berlin, 1839.

(2) Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, p. 9.

(3) Comp. § 11.

§ 8.

AUXILIARY SCIENCES.

Although the different branches of theological science which have successively come before us, are strictly distinct from the history of doctrines, they are nevertheless connected with it as auxiliary sciences.(1) *Archæology,*(2) and the sciences auxiliary to ecclesiastical history,(3) may be added to their number.

(1) *Ecclesiastical history* itself may be viewed in the light of an auxiliary science, since form of church government, of worship, the private life of Christians, etc. have had more or less influence upon the developement of the doctrines. In like manner *Patristics, the history of heresies, the history of universal religion, the history of philosophy,* and *the history of Christian ethics,* are to be numbered amongst the auxiliary sciences.

(2) From the connection between the doctrines and the liturgy of the church, it is obvious, that *Archæology* must be considered as an auxiliary science, if we understand by it the history of Christian worship, [Germ. Cultus.]. This may easily be seen from the use of certain doctrinal phrases, (*e. g.*, ϑεοτόκος etc.) in the liturgies of the church, the appointment of certain festivals, (the feast of Corpus Christi, that of the conception of the Virgin Mary,) the influence of the existence or absence of certain liturgical usages upon the doctrines, (*e. g.* the influence of the

withholding of the sacramental cup from the laity upon the doctrine of concomitancy, comp. § 195.) etc. *Works of reference: Bingham, J.* Origg. s. antiqu. ecclesiasticæ. Halæ, 1751-61. [*Bingham, J.* Antiquities of the Christian church, and other works. Lond. 1834, ss. 8 vols. A new edition is in course of publication.] *J. Jahn*, Biblische Archaeologie. Vienna, 1807-25, 2nd edition, 5 vols. [The Latin abridgement was translated by Prof. *Upham*, and republished in Ward's Library of Standard Divinity.] *Augusti, J. Ch. W.*, Denkwürdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archæologie. Leipz. 1817-31, 12 vols. [Christian Antiquities, translated and compiled from the works of Augusti by the Rev. *Lyman Coleman* of Andover, 1844. *De Wette, W. M. L.*, Lehrbuch der Hebræisch-jüdischen Archæologie, etc. Leipz. 1842. 3rd Edition.] *Rheinwald, F. H.*, kirchliche Archæologie. Berl. 1830. [*Schöne, K.*, Geschichtforschungen über die kirchlichen Gebräuche und Einrichtungen der Kirche. Berl. 1819-22, 3 vols.] *Böhmer, W.*, christlich-kirchliche Alterthumswissenschaft, Bresl. 1836-39, 2 vols.

(3) There are beside those already mentioned: universal history, ecclesiastical philology, ecclesiastical chronology, diplomacy, etc. (Comp. the introductions to works on ecclesiastical history. *Gieseler*, Kirchengesch. I. § 3.)

§ 9.

IMPORTANCE OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

Ernesti, prolusiones de theologiæ historicæ et dogmaticæ conjungendæ necessitate, Lips. 1759, in his Opusc. theol. Lips. 1773-92. *Illgen, Ch. T.*, über den Werth der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, Leips. 1817. *Augusti*, Werth der Dogmengeschichte, in his theologische Blätter II. 2. p. 11, ss. *Hagenbach*, Encyclop. § 69. [*Knapp* l. c. p. 41.]

The importance of the history of doctrines, in a scientific point of view, partly follows from what has already been said: 1. It forms one of the most important branches of ecclesiastical history. 2. It serves as an introduction to the study of dogmatic theology.(1) But it is no less useful in a moral and practical aspect. On the one hand, it exerts a beneficial influence upon the mind of man, by placing before him the efforts and struggles of others in relation to their most important concerns. On the other, it is of special use to the student of theology, for it will preserve him both from that one-sided and rigid adherence to the letter which may be styled false orthodoxy, and from the adoption of daring, superficial, and hastily formed opinions, (false heterodoxy and neology.)(2)

(1) Comp. § 2.

(2) Comp. § 10. The importance of the history of doctrines in both these respects has frequently been overrated. The various parties in the church have either appealed to it in support of their peculiar views, or dreaded its results. Comp. Baumgarten-Crusius, I. p. 16-20.

§ 10.

SCIENTIFIC TREATMENT OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

Daub, die Form der christlichen Dogmen-und Kirchenhistorie in Betracht gezogen, in Bauer's Zeitschrift fur speculative Theologie. Berlin 1836. Part 1 and . *Kliefoth, Th.*, Einleitung in die Dogmengeschichte, Parchim und Ludwigsburg 1839.

The advantage which may be derived from the study of the history of doctrines, depends more or less on the mode of its treatment. That method alone is correct and useful, which clearly represents the constant change, which the definitions of doctrines are undergoing, while the great and essential truths which they teach, remain the same in all ages, and shows in a philosophical manner the connection between the external causes of that change, and the internal dynamic principle.

Although it cannot be said that nothing but the prevailing notions of the age, differences of climate, personal feelings, passions, court intrigues, priestly impositions, and the fanaticism of monks, have determined the character of dogmatic theology, yet we should not wholly set aside their influence. They have not *made* the dogma, but they have assisted in giving it the form in which it has come down to us.

§ 11.

ARRANGEMENT.

The history of doctrines has to consider, on the one hand, the history of *the doctrine* of the church in general, and of the doctrinal *tendencies* which are represented by it; and, on the other, the history of *dogmas,* i. e. of those particular *doctrines, opinions,* and *notions* which form the standard of the church in different ages. Both are to be connected so as to illustrate each other; the general may be made clearer by the particular, and the particular by the general. Resting on these definitions, we consider ourselves justified in making a distinction between the *general* and the *special history* of *doctrines,* which stand in such a relation to each other, that the former is the source of the latter, and, as regards their extent, forms the introduction to it. We think it best to commence each period with the *general history of doctrines,* which, though closely allied to, yet is not identical with the history of dogmatic theology, and then to pass over to *special history of doctrines.*

The history of dogmatic theology presupposes the general history of doctrines, though the latter takes from the former, and incorporates some of its results. They stand in the same relation to each other as the history of jurisprudence to the history of law, the history of æsthetics to the history of art.

§ 12.

DIVISION INTO PERIODS.

Comp. *Hagenbach,* Abhandlung in den theologischen Studien und Kritiken, 1828, part 4. Encyclop. p 244. [*Pelt,* Encyclopaedie § 51.]

The periods of the history of doctrines are to be determined according to the most important epochs (periods of developement) in the history of the theological mind. They do not quite coincide with those adopted in ecclesiastical history,(1) and may be specified as follows:(2)—

I. *Period.* From the close of the Apostolic age to the death of Origen, (from the year 80—254): the age of *Apologetics.*(3.)

II. *Period.* From the death of Origen to John Damascenus, (240—730): the age of *Polemics.*(4)

III. *Period.* From John Damascenus to the Reformation, (730—1517): the age of *Systems* (scholasticism in its widest sense.)(5)

IV. *Period.* From the Reformation to the Abolition of the Formula Consensus in reformed Switzerland, and the rise of the Wolfian philosophy in Germany, (1517—1720): the age of polemico-ecclesiastical *Symbolism.*(6)

V. *Period.* From the year 1720 to the present day: the age of *criticism,* of *speculation,* and of *antithesis* between faith and knowledge, philosophy and Christianity, reason and revelation. (7)

---

(1) Inasmuch as the divisions in ecclesiastical history, and in the history of doctrines are not founded upon the same principles, it is evident that the periods themselves will not be the same. It is true that the developement of the doctrine of the church is connected with the history of church-government, of Christian worship, etc., but the influences which they exert upon each other, are not always manifested at the same time. Thus the Arian controversy took place during the age of Constantine, but was not called forth by his conversion, which, on the other hand, is of so much importance, that it determines a period in ecclesiastical history. On the contrary, the notions of Arius arose out of the speculative tendency of Origen and his followers, which was opposed to Sabellianism. Accordingly, we think it better to fix in this instance upon the death of Origen, and the

rise of the Sabellian controversy, which are nearly coeval, as the principle of division.

(2) The numerical differences are very great. *Baumgarten-Crusius* adopts twelve periods, *Lenz* eight, etc.; *Münscher* gives a different division in his compendium from the one in his manual —in the former he has seven, in the latter only three periods, (ancient time, middle ages, and modern times.) *Engelhardt* and *Mein* have adopted the same division, with this difference, that the latter by subdividing each period into two has six periods. But we think it alike inconvenient to make the periods too long, and to have too great a number of divisions. We admit that the periods in the history of doctrines may be of greater extent than those in ecclesiastical history, because a system of doctrines does not undergo either so frequent, or so rapid changes, as Christian life in general; but natural boundaries which are so distinct as the age of Constantine, should not be lightly disregarded. Generally speaking, *Klee* agrees with us, though he considers the division into periods as superfluous. *Vorländer* also, in his tables, has adopted our terminology. *Rosenkranz* (Encyclopaedie, 2nd edit. p. 259, ss.) makes, according to philosophico-dialectic categories, the following division: 1. Period of Analytic Knowledge, of substantial feeling (Greek Church); 2. Period of Synthetic knowledge, of pure objectivity (Roman Catholic Church). 3. Period of Systematic Knowledge, which comprehends the two former in their unity, and manifests itself in the stages of symbolical orthodoxy, of subjective belief and unbelief, and of the idea of speculative theology, (Protestant Church). The most ingenious division is that of *Kliefoth*, though it be not free from faults peculiar to itself:

1. The Age of Formation of Doctrines.	Greek........	Analytic....	Theology.
2. ———— Symbolical Unity..	Rom. Cath.	Synthetic...	Anthropology.
3. – ——— Perfection (completion).	Protestant.	Systematic.	Soteriology.
4. ———— Dissolution..................	?	?	Church.

On the grounds on which this division rests, see Kliefoth, l. c.

(3) In answer to the question: Why not commence with the first year of our era? comp. § 3. We call this period the age of *Apologetics*, because it is best characterized by the great number of apologetical writings in defence of Christianity against both Judaism and Paganism. Its theology is almost entirely of the same description. The controversies which took place with-

in the church itself, (with Ebionites, Gnostics, etc.), for the most part arose out of the opposition which Christianity met with on the part of judaizing teachers and pagan philosophers, and accordingly the activity which was manifested by the church, partook more or less of an apologetical character. The Fathers of this period were little concerned about systems, and the work of Origen περὶ ἀρχῶν is the only one in which we find some attempt, at least, at systematic theology.

(4) During the second period the conflict proceeds in another direction. Since there was little or no occasion for apologetical writings after the conversion of Constantine, most writers entirely abandoned this field, and entered into questions of a *polemical* nature. The history of ecclesiastical controversies, from the rise of the Sabellian, down to the close of the Monothelite controversy, forms one continuous series; the different parts of which are so intimately connected with each other that it cannot well be interrupted. It is concluded by the work of John Damascenus, (ἔκθεσις πίστεως.) This period with its numerous conflicts, its synods, and councils, is undoubtedly the most important for the history of doctrines, if its importance consists in the efforts that were put forth to complete the building, the foundation of which had been laid in the preceding period.

(5) This period, which we call the *scholastic*, in the widest sense of the word, might be sub-divided into three shorter periods. 1. From John Damascenus to Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury; during this period John Scotus Erigena takes the most prominent position in the West. 2. From Anselm to Gabriel Biel, the age of scholasticism properly so called, which may again be sub-divided; and, 3. from Gabriel Biel to Luther, (the period of transition.) Generally speaking, mystical and scholastic tendencies alternately prevailed during this period; even the forerunners of the Reformation more or less adhered to the one or the other of these tendencies, though they belonged in some respects to the next period.

(6) We might have fixed upon the year 1521, in which the first edition of Melancthon's Loci Communes was published—or upon the year 1530, in which the Confession of Augsburg was drawn up, instead of the year 1517: but, for the sake of convenience, we make our date agree with the one adopted in ecclesiastical history, especially as the *theses* themselves were of im

portance in a doctrinal point of view. Inasmuch as the distinguishing principles of the different sections of the church are brought out very prominently in the age of the Reformation. the history of doctrines naturally assumes the character of Symbolism, (comp. § 4.) The ages of Polemics, and of Scholasticism, may be said to re-appear during this period, though in a different form; we also see various modifications of mysticism in opposition to one-sided rationalism. We might commence a new period with *Calixt* and *Spener*, if their peculiar opinions had been generally spread at that time. Such, however, was not the case.

(7) It may excite surprise that we make the abolition of the test (formula consensus) in the Reformed church of Switzerland determine the extent of the preceding period, since no great importance seems to be attached to it. But it is the signal for the overthrow of those barriers, which had been erected by the confessions of faith. The Wolfian philosophy, which had emancipated itself from the fetters of systematic theology, and had been brought within the reach of all classes, took its rise about the same time in Germany, while the principles of deism and naturalism (which developed themselves in the preceding period) were spread from England and France into other countries. Thus it happens, that, while in the fourth period the polemical and the scholastical of the second and third periods are repeated, the fifth period has the apologetical tendency in common with the first. The question is no more about less important denominational differences, but about the existence, or non-existence of Christianity. This fifth period, which by no means presents one uniform aspect, may be subdivided into three shorter periods. The first of these (from Wolf to Kant) for the most part represents the conflict between a stiff and lifeless form of dogmatic orthodoxy, and an imperfect enlightenment. The second (beginning with *Kant*) exhibits the efforts which were made in favour of rationalism, in order to secure its ascendancy both in science and in the church, in opposition to every form of belief. And, lastly, the third period (which embraces the nineteenth century) presents to our view a picture composed of the most heterogeneous parts, of attempts at reaction and restoration, at idealization and accommodation, and is preparing a new period, of which it forms itself the commencement, but for which history has not yet a name.

§ 13.

SOURCES OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES.

a. Public Sources.

Every thing may be considered as a source of the history of doctrines, which gives a fair representation of the religious belief of a certain period. In the first place come the public confessions of faith or symbols (creeds) of the church;(1) in connection with them we have to compare the acts of councils,(2) the decretals, edicts, circular letters, bulls, and breves of ecclesastical superiors, whether clerical or civil,(3) and, lastly, the catechisms,(4) liturgies(5) and hymn-books(6) which have received the sanction of the church.

(1) Comp. § 4. The ancient creeds may be found in the Acts of Councils mentioned n. 2.; the three creeds commonoly called œcumenical, (the Apostle's creed, the Nicene, and the Athanasian creeds) are also reprinted in the collections of Protestant symbols; comp. *Ch. W. F. Walch*, Bibliotheca symbolica vetus. Lemgoviæ 1770. 8. *Semler, J. S.*, Apparatus ad libros symbolicos ecclesiæ lutheranæ, Hal. 1755 8. COLLECTIONS OF SYMBOLICAL BOOKS, (they become only important since the fourth period): *a) Of the Lutheran church:* Libri symbolici ecclesiæ evangelicæ ad fidem opt. exempl. recens. *I. A. H. Tittmann*, Misn. 1817. 27.—Libri symbolici ecclesiæ evangelicæ s. Concordia, rec. *C. A. Hase*, Lips. 1827. 37. 46. *b) Of the Reformed*: Corpus libror. symbolicor. qui in ecclesia Reformatorum auctoritatem publicam obtinuerunt, ed. *I. Ch. W. Augusti*, Elberf. 1828. Sammlung symb. Bücher der ref. Kirche, von *J. J. Mess.* Neuwied, 1828. 30. 2 vols 8. *H. A. Niemeyer*, Collectio confessionum in ecclesiis refomatis publicatarum, Lips. 1840. 8. *c) Of the Roman Catholic*: *Danz*, libri symbolici ecclesiæ romano-catholicæ, Vimar. 1835.—*Streitwolf u. Klener*, libri symb. eccl. cathol. Gött. 1835. (Comp. the works mentioned § 16, n. 9.) *d) Of the Greek : E. T. Kimmel*, libri symbolici ecclesiæ orientalis. Jen. 1843. 8.

(2) ACTS OF COUNCILS collected by *J. Merlin* (Par. 1523, fol.

Cöln. 1530. ii. Par. 1535.) *Grabbe* (Cöln. 1508. f.) *L. Surius*, Col. 1567. fol. iv. The edition of Sixtus V. Venice, 1585, that of *Binius* (Severinus) Col. 1606. iv. f. *Collectio regia*, Paris, 1644 (by Cardinal Richelieu) xxxvii. f. *Phil. Labbeus* and *Gabr. Cossart*, Par. 1671. 72. xvii. f. *Balluzii* (Stephan.) nova Collectio Conciliorum, Par. 1683. f. (Suppl. Conc. Labbei) incomplete. *Harduin*, (Joh.) Conciliorum collectio regia maxima, seu acta Conciliorum et epistolæ decretales ac constitutiones summorum pontificum, græce et latine ad Phil. Labbei et Gabr. Cossartii labores haud modica accessione facta et emendationibus pluribus additis Par. 1715. xi. (xii.) fol.—*Nic. Coleti*, S. S. Concilia ad regiam edit. exacta etc. Venet. xxiii. with additions by Mansi vi. f.—**Mansi*, (J. Dom.) Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio, Flor. et. Venet. 1759. sqq. xxxi. f. comp. *Ch. W. F. Walch*, Entwurf einer vollständigen Geschichte der Kirchenversammlungen, Lpz. 1759. *Fuchs*, Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen des 4. und 5. Jahrhunderts, Lpz. 1788. 4 vols. Bibliotheca ecclesiastica quam moderante D. Augusto Neander adornavit *Herm. Theod. Bruns*, I. (Canones Apostolorum et Concil. Sæcul. iv. v. vi. vii.) Pars. I. Berol. 1839.

(3) Partly contained in the Acts of Councils.

a) DECREES OF CIVIL GOVERNMENTS EXERCISING AUTHORITY IN ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS, (viz. emperors, kings, magistrates): *Codex Theodosianus*, c. perpetuis commentariis Iac. Gothofredi etc. Edit. Nova in vi. Tom. digesta, ed. Ritter. Lips. 1736.—*Codex Justinianeus*, edid. *Spangenberg*, 1797. *Balluzii* (Steph.) Collectio Capitularium Regum Francorum etc. Par. 1780, ii. f. *Corpus Juris canonici*, (editions of J. H. Böhmer, 1747, and A. L. Richter, 1833.) Under this head come also the regulations concerning the Reformation, agendas, religious edicts of Protestant governments, which, at least formerly, were in a great measure based upon doctrinal principles.

b) PAPAL DECRETALS: Pontificum Romanorum a Clemente usque ad Leonem M. epistolæ genuinæ cur. *C. F. G. Schönemann*, T. i. Gött. 1796. 8.—*Bullarium romanum* a Leone M. usque ad Benedictum XIII. opus. absolutiss. *Laërt. Cherubini*, a D. Angelo Maria Cherubini al. illustratum et auctum et ad Ben. XIV. perductum, Luxemb. 1727. s. xix. fol—Bullarum, privilegiorum et Diplomatum Roman. Pontif. amplissima collect. opera et stud. *Car. Cocquelines*, Rom. 1739—44. xxviii. f.

Eisenschmid, römisches Bullarium, oder Auszüge der merkwürdigsten päbstlichen Bullen, übersetzt und mit fortlaufenden Anmerkungen. Neustadt. 1831, 2 vol.

(4) Catechisms become important only from the age of the Reformation, especially those of Luther, of Heidelberg, of Racow, the Roman Catholic catechism, etc. Some of them, *e. g.* those just mentioned, may be found in collections of symbolical books, (note 1), others are separately published. Comp. *Langemack*, historia catechetica, Stralsund, 1729—33. iii. 1740, iv.

(5) *J. S. Assemani*, Codex liturgus ecclesiæ universæ, Rom. 1749—66. xiii. 4. *Renaudot* (Eus.), liturgiarum orientalium collectio, Paris, 1716. ii. 4. *L. A. Muratori*, liturgia romana vetus. Venet. 1748. ii. f. Compare the missals, breviaries, liturgies, etc. *Augusti's* Denkwürdigkeiten der christlichen Archäologie, vol. v. *Gerbert*, vetus liturgia allemanica, Ulm 1776. ii. 4.

(6) *Rambach*, Anthologie christlicher Gesänge aus allen Jahrhunderten der Kirche, Altona, 1816—22. iv. 8, and the numerous psalm and hymn-books.—How much sacred songs have contributed to the spread of doctrinal opinions, may be seen from the example of Bardesanes, [Gieseler, i. § 46, n. 2], of the Arians, and in later times, of the Flagellantes, the Hussites, etc.; from the history of the sacred hymns of the Lutheran, and the sacred psalms of the Reformed church, the spiritual songs of Angelus Silesius, the Pietists and Moravian brethren, and (in a negative point of view) from the inferior value of modern hymn-books. Comp. *Augusti*, de antiquissimis hymnis et carminibus Christianorum sacris in historia dogmatum utiliter adhibendis, Jen. 1810, and de audiendis in Theologia poëtis, Vratisl. 1812. 15.—*Hahn, A.*, Bardesanes Gnosticus, primus Syrorum hymnologus, 1820. 8. †*Buchegger*, de origine sacræ Christianorum poëseos, Frib. 1827. 4. *Hoffman, Dr. H.*, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes bis auf Luthers Zeit, Breslau, 1832.

§ 14.

b. Private Sources.

Beside the aforesaid public sources, we have a number of private sources. These are, 1. The works of the

Fathers, theologians, and ecclesiastical writers of all ages since the Christian era;(1) but they are not all of the same description, and we have accordingly to distinguish between scientific and strictly doctrinal works on the one hand, and practical (sermons) and occasional works (letters, etc.) on the other.(2) 2. The works of secular writers, *e. g.* of Christian philosophers and poets of certain periods.(3) 3. Lastly, we may derive additional information from that indefinite form of popular belief, which manifests itself in legends, proverbial sayings, and songs, and from the monuments of Christian art, inasmuch as they represent certain religious views.(4)

---

(1) Comp. § 5. Concerning the distinction (which is very relative) made between Fathers, theologians, and ecclesiastical writers, see the introductions to the works on Patristics, *e. g.* *Möhler*, p. 17—19. The Fathers of the first centuries are followed by the compilers, scholastic and mystic divines of the middle ages, and these again by the Reformers and their opponents, the polemical writers of various sections of the church, and the later theologians in general. Their particular works will come before us in their proper place. Works of a more general character are: *Fabricii, J. G.*, Bibliotheca ecclesiastica, Hamb. 1718, f. *Cave, W.*, Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum historia litteraria, Lond. 1688. 91. Oxon. 1740. 43. Bas. 1749. *C. Oudin*, Comment. de scriptoribus ecclesiæ antiquis, Lips. 1722, iii. *L. El. Dupin*, nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques, Par. 1686—1714. xlvii. 8. Bibliothèque des auteurs séparés de la communion de l'église romaine du 16. et 17. siècle, Par. 1718, 19. iii. Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques du 18. siècle, par *Claude Pierre Goujet*, Par. 1736. 37. iii. 8. comp. *Richard Simon*, Critique de la Bibliothéque, etc. Paris, 1730. iv. 8. *Ceillier*, *Remy*, Histoire générale des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques, Paris 1729—63. xxiii. 4. *J. G. Walch*, Bibliotheca patristica, Jen. 1770. 8. Edit. nova auctior et emendatior adornata a *I. T. L. Danzio*, Jen. 1834. *Assemani, I. S.*, Bibliotheca orientalis, Rom. 1719—28. iii in. 4 vols. f. *Oelrichs, J. G. A.*, Commentarii de scriptoribus ecclesiæ latinæ, Lips. 1791. 8. *Schönemann, C. F. G.*, Bibliotheca historico-litteraria a Tertul-

liano principe usque ad Gregorium M. et Isidorum Hispal. Lips. 1792. 94. ii. 8. *Rössler, Ch. F.*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, Leipz. 1776—86. x. 8. *Augusti, J. Ch. W.*, Chrestomathia patristica ad usum eorum, qui historiam christianam accuratius discere cupiunt, Lips. 1812. ii. 8. *Royaards, D. H. I.*, Chrestomathia patristica, Pars. I. Traj. ad Rhen. 1831. *Engelhardt*, litterarischer Leitfaden zu Vorlesungen über die Patristik. † *Winter*, Patrologie, München, 1814. †*Goldwitzer, F. W.*, Bibliographie der Kirchenväter und Kirchenlehrer, vom 1. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert, Landsh. 1828. †*Möhler, Dr. J. A.*, Patrologie oder christliche Litterargeschichte, aus dessen Nachlasse herausgegeben von *Reithmayr*. 1st vol. Regensb. 1839. 8. *Danz, J. T. L.*, Initia doctrinæ patristicæ introductionis instar in Patrum ecclesiæ studium, Jen. 1839. *Böhringer*, die Kirche Christi und ihre Zeugen, oder die Kirchengeschichte in Biographien, Zur. 1842—46, I. 1—4

A. BEST COLLECTIONS OF THE WORKS OF THE FATHERS: *Magna bibliotheca veterum patrum*, primo quidem a *Margarito de la Bigne* composita, postea studio Coloniens. Theolog. aucta etc. (with Auctuarium by F. Ducæus and Fr. Combefisius) 1664—72. v. f.—*Maxima bibliotheca vett. Patr.* etc. Lugd. 1677. xxvii. f.—*And. Gallandii*, Bibliotheca græco-latina vett. Patrum, etc. Venet. 1765-81. xiv. f. *Philological aids: J. C. Suiceri* thesaurus ecclesiasticus, Amst. 1682. (1728. Traj. 1746.) ii. f.—*Du Fresne* (du Cange) *Car.* Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ latinitatis, Paris, 1733—36. vi. f.

B. COLLECTIONS OF THE WORKS OF ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS DURING THE MIDDLE AGES, (more important for ecclesiastical history in general, than for doctrine-history in particular): *Meibomius, Basnage, Muratori, Mabillon, *Martène et Durand* (Thesaurus Anecd. v. f.) * *Pertz* (Monumenta, 1826—35) etc. comp. the literature in *Hase*, Kirchengeschichte, 5th edit. p. 175, ss. For the East: Scriptores Byzantini (Par. 1645, ss.) and latest edition by **Niebuhr*, Bonn. 1829, ss.

C. COLLECTIONS OF THE WORKS OF THE REFORMERS; *Bretschneider*, Corpus Reformatorum, Halæ 1834-46, xii. 4. (containing as yet works of Melancthon only); the works of individual reformers will be named in their proper place.

D. ON MODERN DOGMATIC LITERATURE: *Walch, J. G.* Bibliotheca theologica, T. I. Jen. 1757. *Winer, G. B.*, Handbuch der theologischen Litteratur, S. 290, ss. *Bretschneider*, systematische Entwickelung aller in der dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe, u. s. w. Lpz. 1841—8.

(2) Since the earlier theologians, *e. g.* Origen drew a distinction between what they taught the people *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, and what they propounded in a scientific manner; since popular writers generally do not make any pretension to dogmatic precision, it is easy to see that practical works are not of so much importance for the history of doctrines, as strictly dogmatic works. But, like all liturgical works, etc., they may be regarded as indications of the dogmatic mind of certain periods.—Homiliarium patristicum, edid. *Ludov., Pelt* et *A. Rheinwald,* Berol. 1829. deinde *H. Rheinwald* et *C. Vogt*, Ber. 1831.—*Lentz, E. G. H.*, Geschichte der christlichen Homiletik, ii. Braunschw. 1839. 8. *Paniel,* pragmatische Geschichte der christl. Beredsamkeit und der Homiletik, i. 1. 2. Lpz. 1839. 8. During the middle ages, the sermons of Berthold, Tauler, etc., in the time of the Reformation, those of the Reformers, etc. come into consideration. Modern homiletical literature also gives a more or less faithful representation of dogmatic tendencies.

(3) Comp. § 13. note 6. As sacred hymns were numbered among the public sources, so poetical compositions in general may be considered as private sources, *e. g.* the works of some of the earlier poets, of those commonly called Minnesingers, Dante's divina commedia, and many others. In like manner, a comparison between the poetical views of Milton, Shakespeare, Göthe, Byron, or the romantic school, and the doctrinal opinions of the church, might lead to interesting results. A history of *Christian* poetry in its whole extent, and all its relations to the dogmatic mind of every period, does not as yet exist.

(4) The influence which popular belief (though mixed up with remnants of heathenish superstitions), may have exerted upon certain dogmatic notions, *e g.* concerning the devil and hell, is deserving particular attention, (comp. *Grimm's* deutsche Mythologie.) The dogmatic mind also manifests itself in the silent monuments of art: ecclesiastical buildings, tombs, vasa sacra, paintings, *e. g.* representing the general judgment, or the Deity itself, (comp. *Grüneisen, C.* über bildliche Darstellung der Gottheit, Stuttg. 1828.) Coins, gems, etc. (*Münter*, Sinnbilder und Kunstvorstellungen der alten Christen, Altona, 1825. 4. *Bellermann,* die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxasbilde, Berlin, 1817.)

§ 15.

c. Indirect Sources.

We have not always access to direct sources, but must frequently consult indirect sources, *i. e.* accounts or reports which have been transmitted to us by other writers, as this is the case, to a great extent, in relation to the opinions of heretics,(1) many of whose writings were destroyed at an early period. In like manner, the works of some of the Fathers are either entirely lost, or have come down to us only in a corrupt form.(2) In the use of both the direct and indirect sources much critical skill is needful.

(1) Hence the accounts given by different writers of Cerinthus, the Ebionites, Gnostics, Manicheans, etc., frequently vary from one another, and even contradict each other.

(2) Thus in the case of Origen, of whose writings we frequently have nothing but the translations of Rufinus, or the relations of Jerome and Eusebius.

§ 16.

COMPENDIUMS.

As all the sources are not at the command of every reader, and as their study, generally speaking, will only be useful when we have already acquired a general idea of the history which we intend more fully to investigate, we are directed, in the first instance, to the works of those who, by their own historical researches, have placed the treasures of science within the reach of all who are desirous of obtaining information. The history of doctrines itself has been treated as a separate branch of theological science only in modern times;(1) yet some of the earlier or ecclesiastical writers,(2) no less than theologians,(3) have prepared the way for it. Be-

L.I.F.E. College Library

side those works which treat on the history of doctrines exclusively,(4) we have to compare the modern works on ecclesiastical history,(5) as well as biographies of the Fathers and treatises on particular subjects,(6) along with those works on dogmatic theology,(7) and Christian ethics,(8) which combine the historical with the systematical. Lastly, The literature of symbolism(9) forms (according to § 4.) a part of that of the history of doctrines.

(1) The history of doctrines was formerly treated in connection with ecclesiastical history, or dogmatic theology, (comp. § 2.) *Semler* and *Ernesti* first shewed the necessity of separating the one from the other. The former attempted to treat them separately in his historical introduction to Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre, Halle 1759, iii. 4. His design was, (according to I. p. 101): "*to expand the views of young divines or studiosi theologiæ in general, and to shew the origin, nature, and true object of dogmatic theology.*" In the same year J. A. Ernesti published his treatise: de theologiæ historicæ et dogmaticæ conjungendæ necessitate et modo universo, Lips. 1759. (Opusc. theol. Lips. 1773. ed. 2. 1792. p. 567.); he does not indeed speak of the history of doctrines as a separate science, but it is not difficult to perceive that he felt the necessity of its being so. Comp. also *C. W. F. Walch*, Gedanken von der Geschichte der Glaubenslehre, 2 edit. Gött. 1764. 8.

(2) Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, etc. (Editions of *Valesius*, Par. 1659. iii. *Reading*, Cant. 1720. iii. f.—Manual edition of Eusebius by *Heinichen*, Lips. 1827—28. iii.) [English translations of Euseb., Socrat., Sozom., Theod., and Evagrius, were published by Bagster, Lond. 6 vols.] Rufinus, Sulpicius Severus, Cassiodorus, Epiphanius Scholasticus. *Writers during the middle ages:* Gregor. Turonensis, Beda Venerabilis, Adamus Bremensis, Nicephorus Callisti, etc. (comp. the literature in works on ecclesiastical history.) *Since the Reformation:* the *Magdeburg Centuriators* under the title: Ecclesiastica historia per aliquot studiosos et pios viros in urbe Magdeburgica, Bas. 1559—74. xiii. f. † *Cæs. Baronius*, Annales ecclesiastici, Rom. 1588—1607. xii f. † *Odoricus Raynaldus,* Annales eccles. Rom. 1646—1674 x. f (both edited by *Mansi*, along with the Critica historico-theologica of Pagi, Luccæ, 1738. 39. xxxiii. f.—*J. G. Arnold*,

unparteiische Kirchen-und Ketzerhistorie, Fkft. 1699, iv. f. † *Nat. Alexander*, Historia ecclesiastica, Par. 1676—86. xxiv. 8. Venet. 1759. 1778. ix. f. † *Fleury*, histoire ecclésiastique, Paris, 1691—1720. xx. 4. (continued by *Jean Claude Fabre*, Paris, 1726—1740. xvi. 4. and *Al. de la Croix*, Par. 1776—78. vi.) Par. xxxvi. 12. 1740. 41. † *Tillemont*, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des 6 premiers siècles, justifiés par les citations des auteurs originaux, Paris, 1693. ss. xvi. 4. *L. Moshemii*, Institutionum historiæ eccles. antiquioris et recentioris libri IV. Helmst. 1755. 1764. 4. *Walch, Ch. W. F.*, Historie der Ketzereien, Spaltungen und Religionsstreitigkeiten, Leipz. 1762—85. xi. *Baumgarten, J. S.*, Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten mit einigen Anmerkungen, Vorrede und fortgesetzten Geschichte der christlichen Glaubenslehre, herausgegeben von Dr. *J. S. Semler*, Halle, 1762—64. iii. 4. *By the same:* Geschichte der Religionsparteien, herausgegeben von *J. S. Semler*, ibid. 1766. 4.

(3) † *Petavius.* (*Dion.*), Opus de theologicis dogmatibus, Par. 1644—50. iv. Antw. 1700. vi. " (*This work is no less ingenious than profound, and deserves to be more carefully and frequently studied, than is generally done.*" [Dorner].) † *Thomassin, L.*, dogmata theologica, Par. 1684—89. † *Dumesnil, Lud.*, Doctrina et disciplina ecclesiæ, ex ipsis verbis SS. codd. concc. PP. et vett. genuinorum monumentorum sec. seriem temporis digesta, iv. Col. 1730. f. *Io. Forbesius a Corse*, Instructiones historico-theologicæ de doctrina christiana et vario rerum statu, ortisque erroribus et controversiis etc. Amst. 1645. f. Gen. 1699, and in his Opera, Amst. 1703. ii. f. (vol. 2.) The design of this work is to prove the agreement between the doctrines of the Reformers, and the opinions of the earlier Fathers, (especially in opposition to Bellarmin.) The various loci of *Chemnitz*, *Hutter*, *Quenstädt*, *Baier*, and of *Joh. Gerhard* in particular, contain much historical matter: *J. Gerhard*, loci theol. (Edit. of *Cotta*) Tüb. 1762—89. xxii. 4. Works which form the transition to the treatment of the history of doctrines as separate science: *Lor. Reinhard*, Introductio in historiam præcipuorum dogmatum, Jen. 1795. 4., and *J. S. Baumgarten*, evangelische Glaubenslehre, Halle, 1759. 60. 4 (the beforementioned preface to this work by Semler.)

(4) COMPENDIUMS AND MANUALS OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES: *Lange, S. G.*, ausführliche Geschichte der Dogmen, Lpz. 1796. incomplete.) *Wundemann, J. Ch.*, Geschichte der christlichen

Glaubenslehren vom Zeitalter des Athanasius bis Gregor den Gr., 1st and 2nd vol. Leipz. 1798—99. **Münscher, W.*, Handbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, Marb. vol. i. a. ii. 1797. 3d edit. without any alteration, 1817. 18. vol. iii. 1802. 1804. vol. iv. 1809. (Only to the year 604.) the first historico-philosophical treatment of the history of doctrines. *By the same:* Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, ebend. 1812. 1819. 3d edit. mit Belegen aus den Quellenschriften, Ergänzungen der Literatur, historischen Notizen und Fortsetzungen versehen von **Dan. von Cöln* 1st part, Cassel 1832. 2d part, ibid. 1834. (edited by *Hupfeld);* 2d part 2d section (also under the title: Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte von der Reformationszeit bis auf unsere Tage) by *Ch. Gotth. Neudecker*, ibid. 1838. 8. *Münter, Friedr.*, Handbuch der ältesten christlichen Dogmengeschichte, aus dem Dän. von *Evers*, 1st vol. Gött. 1802. 8. (incomplete.) **Augusti, J. Ch. W.*, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, Leipz. 1805. 4th edit. 1835. *Bertholdt, L.* Handbuch der Dogmengeschichte, herausg. von *Veit Engelhardt*, Erl. 1822. 23. ii. 8. *Ruperti, F. A.*, Geschichte der Dogmen, oder Darstellung der Glaubenslehre des Christenthums von seiner Stiftung bis auf die neueren Zeiten, insbesondere für Studierende der Theologie und zu ihrer Vorbereitung auf ihre Prüfung, Berlin, 1831. **Baumgarten-Crusius, L. F. O.*, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, Jena 1832. ii. 8. *Lentz, C. G. H.*, Geschichte der christlichen Dogmen in pragmatischer Entwicklung, Helmst. 1834, 1st vol. †*Klee, H.*, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte 1st vol. Mainz. 1837, 2nd vol. 1838. *Engelhardt, J. G. V.*, Dogmengeschichte, II. vols. Neust. 1839. **Meier, Karl*, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte für akademische Vorlesungen, Giessen 1840. (**Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium der christlichen Dogmengeschichte, Lpz. I. 1840. II. 1846, (edited by *Hase.*)

Tables: *Hagenbach, K. R.*, tabellarische Uebersicht der D. G. bis auf die Reformation, Basel 1828. 4. *Vorländer, Karl*, tabell. übersichtl. Darstellung der Dogmengesch. nach Neanders dogmengeschichtl. Vorlesungen. Per. i. Hamb. 1835. P. ii. 1837.

(5) COMPLETE WORKS OF MODERN AUTHORS ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, WHICH INCLUDE MORE OR LESS OF THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES: *Schröckh, J. M.*, christliche Kirchengeschichte, Lpz. 1768—1803, xxxv. 8, since the Reformation (continued by *Tzschirner*), 1804—1810, x. 8. *Henke*, allgemeine Geschichte der

christlichen Kirche nach der Zeitfolge, Branschw. 1788, ss. continued by *Vater*, ix. (in several editions.) *Schmidt, J. E. Ch.*, Handbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte, Giessen und Darmstadt 1801, ss. vi. 2d. edit. 1825—27.) vii. vol. by *Rettberg* 1834. **Neander, Aug.*, allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche, Hamb. 1825-45, i-v. in 10 parts. **Gieseler, L.*, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, Bonn 1824-45, 3 vols. in several parts, (i. 4th edit. in 2 parts; ii. in 4 parts; iii. 1. 1840.) [i and ii. are translated into English by *Francis Cunningham*, Philad. 3 vols. Of a new translation by *Dr. Davidson*, the first volume was published 1846. Edinb.] *Schleiermacher*, Geschichte der christl. Kirche, herausgeg. von *F. Bonnell*, Berlin, 1840, i.

Shorter works are the Compendiums of *Städlin, Münscher, Näbe, Engelhardt, Guerike*, 2 vols. *Hase*. *Tables* of *Vater, Möller*. For fuller information concerning the literature and auxiliary sources of Ecclesiastic. Hist. comp. the works on church history.

Works on the Ecclesiast. Hist. of particular periods: a. *Of the ancient times. Moshemii* Commentarius de rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum M. Helmstad. 1753. 4. b. *Of the middle ages*, (with special reference to Scholastic Divinity:) *Bossuet, J. B.*, Einleitung in die allgemeine Geschichte der Welt bis auf Kaiser Karl den Gr., übersetzt und mit einem Anhange historisch-kritischer Abhandlungen vermehrt von *Joh. Andr. Cramer*, Lpz. 1757—86. vii. 8. c. *Of the time of the Reformation* (in addition to works on the History of the Reformation:) *Planck, J. C.*, Geschichte der Enstehung, der Veränderungen und Bildung unseres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs, von Anfang der Reformation bis zur Einführung der Concordienformel, vi. 2d edit. Lpz. 1791—1800. d. *Of modern times: By the same*, Geschichte der prot. Theol. von der Concordienformel an bis in die Mitte des 18, Jahrh. Gött. 1831. 8. Comp. *Walch, J. G.*, histor. u. theolog. Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten in und aufserhalb der lutherischen Kirche, Jena, 1733. x. 8.

(6) Works which treat on particular subjects will be mentioned in their proper place. Essays in which the systems of individual Fathers are more fully discussed, will be found in the works of Rössler, Augusti, Möhler, etc. mentioned § 14. note 1.

(7) WORKS ON DOGMATIC THEOLOGY WHICH ALSO CONSIDER THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES, or include it: *Seiler, G. I.*, Theologia dogmatico-polemica, cum compendio historiæ dogmatum, Ed. 3.

Erl. 1789. 8. *Gruner, I. F.,* Institutionum theologiæ dogmaticæ lib. iii. Hal. 1777. 8. *Döderlein, I. Ch.,* Institutio theologi christiani in capitibus religionis theoreticis, Ed. 6. Alt. 1797. ii. 8. *Städlin, C. Fr.,* Lehrbuch der Dogmatik und Dogmengeschichte (Gött. 1801. 1809.) 1822. 8. * *Wegscheider, I. A. L.,* Institutiones theol. christ. dogmaticæ, addita singulorum dogmatum historia et censura, Hal. 1815, ed. 8. 1844. **Bretschneider, C. G.,* Handbuch der Dogmatik der evangelischen Kirche, ii. 8. Lpz. 1828. *By the same:* Versuch einer systematischen Entwicklung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe, nach den symb. Büchern der luth. Kirche, Lpz. 1841. **Hase, Karl,* Lehrbuch der evangelischen Dogmatik, Stuttg. 1826. 8. (3d edit. Lpz. 1842.) **By the same:* Gnosis oder evang. Glaubenslehre für die Gebildeten in der Gemeinde, wissenschaftlich dargestellt, 3 vols. Lpz. 1827—29. [*Knapp, G. Ch.,* Vorlesungen über die christliche Glaubenslehre, herausgeg. von *Thilo.* 2d edit. 1837. Christian Theology by G. Ch. Knapp, translated into English by *Leon. Woods,* jun. And. 1831. *Hahn, Aug.* Lehrbuch der christl. Dogmatik, Lpz. 1828.] *On the history of the Protestant doctrine:* **De Wette, W. M. L.,* Dogmatik der evangelischlutherischen Kirche, nach den symbolischen Büchern und den ältern Dogmatikern, (as 2d part of his Lehrb. der christl. Dogmatik) 2 edit. Berlin, 1821. 3d edit. 1840. *Klein, F. A.,* Darstellung des dogmatischen Systems der evangel. prot. Kirche, Jena, 1822. 2d edit. revised by Dr. *Lobegott Lange,* ibid. 1835. **Hase,* Hutterus redivivus, od. Dogmatik der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, Lpz. 1829—45. 6th edit. WORKS ON THE HISTORY OF DOGMATIC THEOLOGY: *Heinrich, Ch. G.,* Versuch einer Geschichte der verschiedenen Lehrarten der christl. Glaubenswahrheiten und der merkwürdigsten Systeme und Compendien derselben, von Christo bis auf unsere Zeiten, Lpz. 1790. *Schickedanz, J. H.,* Versuch einer Geschichte der christl. Glaubenslehre und der merkwürdigsten Systeme, Compendien, Normalschriften und Katechismen der christl. Hauptparteien, Braunschw. 1827. *Flügge* und *Städlin,* Geschichte der theol. Wissenschaften.

(8) *Städlin, K. F.,* Geschichte der Sittenlehre Jesu, 3 vols. Gött. 1799—1812. **De Wette,* Christliche Sittenlehre, iii. 8. Berlin, 1819—24. The shorter Compendium of the same author: Lehrbuch der christlichen Sittenlehre und der Geschichte derselben, Berlin, 1833. 8.

(9) Comp. § 13. note 1. and § 4. (on the signification of Symbolism.) **Marheinecke*, Dr. *Phil.*, christl. Symbolik, oder historisch-kritische und dogmatisch-comparative Darstellung des katholischen, lutherischen, reformirten und socinianischen Lehrbegriffs, Heidelb. vol. i. part i. ii. 1810. part iii. 1813. (also under the title: das System des Katholicismus.) *By the same:* Institutiones symbolicæ, doctrinam Catholicorum, Protestantium, Socinianorum, ecclesiæ græcæ minorumque societatt. christ. summam et discrimina exhibentes, Berol. 1812. ed. 3. 1830. *Marsh, Herb.*, [The Churches of Rome and England compared: translated into German under the following title:]—vergleichende Darstellung der prot. engl. u. röm. kath. Kirche, oder Prüfung des Protestantismus und Katholicismus u. s. w., a. d. Engl. m. Anm. von *I. C. Schreiter,* Sulzb. 1821. 8. * *Winer, G. B.*, comparative Darstellung des Lehrbegriffs der verschiedenen christlichen Kirchenpartheien, nebst vollständigen Belegen aus den symbolischen Schriften derselben in der Ursprache (mit angehängten Tabellen) Lpz.1824. 4. new edit. 1837. †*Möhler, I. A.* Symbolik, oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten, nach ihren öffentlichen Bekenntnissschriften, Mainz. 1832. edit. 6th 1843. 8. On the other side: *Baur, Ferd. Chr.*, Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus nach den Principien und Hauptdogmen der beiden Lehrbegriffe Tüb. 1834. 8. *Nitzsch, K. Im.*, prot. Beantwort. der Symbolik Möhlers; in reply: *Möhler*, neue Untersuchung der Lehrgegensätze zwischen den Katholiken und Protestanten, Mainz. 1834. 35. 8. and again: *Baur*, Erwiderung auf Möhlers neueste Polemik u. s. w. Tüb. 1834. 8.—*Köllner, Ed.*, Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen, vol. I. Symbolik der luth. Kirche, Hamb. 1837. vol. II. Symbolik der römischen Kirche, 1844. *Guerike, H. E. F.*, allgem. christl. Symbolik vom luth. kirchl. Standpuncte, Lpz. 1839. Editions of the symbolical books, comp. § 13. note 1.)

FIRST PERIOD.

FROM THE APOSTOLIC AGE TO THE DEATH OF ORIGEN, OR FROM THE YEAR 80 TO THE YEAR 254.

THE AGE OF APOLOGETICS.

A GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIRST PERIOD.

§ 17.

CHRIST AND CHRISTIANITY.

On the Life of Christ in general comp. the earlier harmonies of the gospels, [*Davidson, S.* in Kitto l. c. sub voce,] and the modern works of *Hess*, *Hase*, *Paulus*, *Strauss*, and (in reference to the latter) *Weisse*, *Neander*, *Wilke*, *Kuhn*, *Theile*, *Lange*, *Ebrard*, etc. [Voices of the Church, in reply to Dr. Strauss, by the Rev. *J. R. Beard*, Lond. 1845.] Concerning the internal or apologetico-dogmatic aspect of his life, which forms the basis of the history of doctrines, comp. (*Reinhard*,) Versuch über den Plan, den der Stifter der christlichen Religion zum Besten der Menschheit entwarf, Wittenberg, 1781. new edit. with additions by *Heubner*, Wittenb. 1830. (primarily as a reply to the Wolfenbüttel Fragments.) *Herder, F. G.*, vom Erlöser der Menschen, nach den drei ersten Evangelien, Riga 1796. *By the same:* vom Sohne Gottes, der Welt Heiland, nach Johannes, Riga 1797. (Comp. Werke zur Religion und Theologie, vol. xi. or Christliche Schriften, part 1.) *Böhme, Ch. F.*, die Religion Jesu Christi, aus ihren Urkunden dargestellt, Halle 1825–27. **Ullmann,* über die Sündlosigkeit Jesu, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1828. part 1, reprinted, Hamb. 1833. 5th edit. 1845. [Dr. Ullmann, on the sinless Character of Jesus, in Clark's Students' Cabinet Library of Useful Tracts.] *By the same*: Was setzt die Stiftung der christlichen Kirche durch einen Gekreuzigten voraus? in the Studien und Kritiken, 1822–3. p. 579. 596. (and reprinted in his treatise: Historisch oder mythisch? Beiträge zur Beantwortung der gegenwärtigen Lebensfrage der Theologie, Hamb. 1838.) *Fritzsche, Ch. F.* de ἀναμαρτησίᾳ Jesu Christi, Commentationes 4. (reprinted in Fritzschiorum opuscula academica, Lips. 1838. p. 48. seq.) **Schweizer, Alex.*, über die Dignität des Religionstifters, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1834. *Lücke, F.* two programmes (against Hase:) Examinatur, quæ speciosius nuper commendata est sententia de mutato per eventa adeoque sensim emendato Christi consilio, Gött. 1831. 4. On the other side: *Hase*, Streitschriften, Leipz. 1834.—*Strauss* and his opponents. (The Literature in *Theile* and elsewhere.)

THE incarnation of our Redeemer, and the introduction of Christianity into the world, may be considered as the germ of the history of doctrines.

The object of all further investigations is, in the positive point of view, to develope this germ; in the negative, to guard it against all foreign additions and influences. Accordingly, we assume as an apologetical axiom, that Jesus Christ brought to light something which, in relation to the past,(1) was new and original, *i.e.* a revelation, and in relation to the future, is theoretically perfect, and does not stand in need of any correction or improvement.(2) This is the principle on which the history of doctrines proceeds, and according to which we judge of all its phenomena. We cannot, therefore, separate his doctrine from his person. For the peculiar and spotless relation in which Christ, as the Son of God, stands to the Deity, as well as the spiritual and moral regeneration which from himself, as the Saviour, should flow to mankind, form the germ and central point of his doctrine. It bears not the character of a system composed of certain already established ideas, but it is a religious and moral fact, the joyful news (εὐαγγέλιον, κήρυγμα) of which should proclaim salvation to all men on the condition of faith, and a willingness to repent and obey in newness of life. Jesus is not the author of a *dogmatic theology*, but the author and finisher of *faith*, (Heb. xii. 2.) not the founder of a school, but emphatically the founder of religion and of the church. On this account he did not propound dogmas dressed in a scientific garb, but he taught the word of God in a simply human and popular manner, for the most part in parables and sentences. We find these enumerated in the canonical gospels, though in a somewhat different form in the gospel of John from that in the synoptical gospels.(3) It is the common object of evangelical interpretation, of the history of the life of Jesus, of apologetics and biblical theology, to ascertain their peculiar contents, and to reduce them to certain fundamental ideas, and one uniform principle.

(1) "*The office of the Saviour was not to propound doctrines, to establish doctrinal formulæ, but to manifest himself, and to reveal his unity with the Father. His person was a fact, but not an idea.*" *Schwegler*, Montanismus, p. 3. Our Saviour, indeed, adopted many notions already in existence, especially the Mosaic doctrine of *one* God, and perhaps to some extent the prevailing opinions and expectations of the age concerning the doctrine of angels, the kingdom of God, etc. But to consider him merely as the reformer of Judaism, would be to take a very narrow view of his work ; See *Schwegler*, das nachapostolische Zeitalter, p. 89, ss. On the relation in which the history of doctrines stands to the doctrine propounded by Jesus and his apostles, see *Dorner*. Entwickelungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, I. 1. p. 68.

(2) That Christianity should become more perfect is impossible, from the Christian point of view, if we look merely at the *idea* of religion as taught by the Son of God ; for this is no less perfect in itself than it is realized by the incarnation of Christ. There is therefore no room within the history of doctrines for a new revelation, which could supersede that system of which Jesus is the founder. (Comp. the recent controversy in reference to the question whether, and in how far, *individuals* may be said to attain unto perfection.)

(3) In the synoptical gospels we find more of *doctrina Christi*, in John more of *doctrina de Christo*—hence the former are more objective, the latter is more subjective. But though this must be admitted, it does not follow, that John's relations are on that

account less worthy of credit; comp. *Ebrard*, das Evang. Johannis, Zür. 1845. How far, moreover, the divine dignity of Christ comes forward also in the synoptic gospels, see *Dorner's* work, mentioned above, p. 79, ss.

§ 18.

THE APOSTLES.

* *Neander*, Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel, vol. ii. sect. 6. [History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church of the Apostles, translat. by *J. E. Ryland*, Edinb. 1842. vol. ii. book vi: The Apostolic Doctrine.] *Matthaei, G. Ch. R.*, der Religionsglaube der Apostel Jesu, nach seinem Ursprunge und Werthe, vol. i. Gött. 1826. 8. *Böhme Ch. F.* die Religion der Apostel Jesu Christi, aus ihren Urkunden dargestellt, Halle, 1829.—*Kleuker*, Johannes, Petrus and Paulus, Riga, 1785. *Schmid, T. Ch. E.* Dissertationes II. de theologia Joannis Apostoli, Jen. 1801. * *Usteri, L.* Entwickelung des Paulinischen Lehrbegriffs in seinem Verhältniss zur biblischen Dogmatik des N. Test. Zurich 1824. 29. 31. 32. *Dähne, A. F.*, Entwickelung des Paulinischen Lehrbegriffs, Halle 1835. *Baur, Ferd.*, der Apostel Paulus, Tub. 1845. *Köstlin*, der Lehrbegriff des Evangelium und der Briefe Johannis und die verwandten neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe. Berl. 1843. *Steiger, W.* der erste Brief Petri, mit Berüksichtigung des ganzen biblischen Lehrbegriffs, Berlin, 1832. *Ulrich, M.*, Versuch einer Eintheilung der biblischen Dogmatik des Neuen Testaments, in Röhrs Krit. Predigerbibliothek, xix. 1. [*Frommann*, Johanneischer Lehrbegriff, 1831. *Tholuck*, Remarks on the Life, Character, and Style of the Apostle Paul, in Clark's Student's Cabinet Library of Useful Tracts.] *Zeller*, Aphorismens über Christenthum, Urchristenthum and Unchristenthum, in Schwegler's Jahrbücher der Gegenwart. 1844 (June.) *Schwegler, A.*, des nachapostolische Zeitalter, Tüb. 1846. 1st vol. *Dietlein, W. O.*, das Urchristenthum, eine Beleuchtung der von der Schule des Dr. Baur in Tübingen über das apostolische Zeitalter aufgestellten Vermuthungen, Halle, 1845. *Dorner*, l. c. *Schwegler*, Apologetisches und Polemisches (gegen Dorner) in Zeller's Jahrbücher.

The first disciples of the Lord were, like their Master, far from propounding dogmatic systems. But as they had made the doctrine primarily taught by Christ himself, the subject of theoretical consideration and contemplation, as their hearts and lives practically bore witness to the truths they had received, and Christ's spiritual nature had been renewed, and as it were personified in them, we find in the writings of the more talented among them,(1) traces of a system of Christian doctrines. While *Peter* and *James* (and in this respect they may be compared to the synoptical writers) simply relate what is delivered to them without any subjective reflection,(2) we find that an internal and contemplative perception of Christianity prevails in the writings of *John*, but a practico-dialectic tendency in those of *Paul*, who was afterwards called.(3) They may be said to be types of later theological modes of thinking and teaching.(4)

(1) If we speak of the *apostolic* doctrine in general, we have to bear in mind that we do not refer to the *twelve* Apostles, of whose doctrinal views we possess but very imperfect knowledge. For it is yet uncertain, whether the Epistle of *James* was written by the Apostle of that name (James the Less), or by James, the brother of the Lord (which is more probable); the same may be said respecting the Epistle of *Jude*. (Comp. *Herder*, Briefe zweier Brüder Jesu in unserm Kanon; *Wieseler*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1842. I. p. 71, ss.; **Schaf*, das Verhältniss s. des Jacobus, Bruders des Herrn, zu Jacobus Alphæi, Berl. 1842, and the commentaries.) [*Lardner*, vi. 162-202; *Wright, W.*, in Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Literat.] Accordingly *Peter* and *John* alone remain; but the second epistle of the one, and the second and third epistles of the other, were very early reckoned amongst the Antilegomena [*Wright, W.* in Kitto, l. c. sub voce]; the genuineness of the second epistle of Peter in particular has again been impugned in modern times. Comp. *De Wette's* Einleitung ins N. Test. § 172. 173. [*Neander*, hist. of the plant. and train. of the ch. ii. p. 33, 34. *Wright, W.*, in Kitto, l. c. sub voce.]

(2) If the first epistle of Peter is genuine, it is undoubtedly of greater importance in the dogmatic point of view, than that of James, who gives a greater prominence to practical Christianity, and scarcely once refers to the doctrine respecting Christ, though he occasionally evinces a profound acquaintance with the nature of faith, and the Divine economy, (ch. i. 13, ss. 25; ii. 10, etc.) But dogmatic ideas appear in the writings of Peter more as a vast mass of materials, which are, as yet, in their rough state; "*In vain we look in his writings for that decided originality, the stamp of which is so manifestly impressed upon the works of John and Paul.*" *De Wette*, l. c. Comp. however

Rauch, Rettung der Originalität des ersten Briefes Petri, in Winer's and Engelhardt's Kritische Journal, viii. p. 396. *Steiger*, l. c. and *Dorner*, p. 97, ss. [" *It bears with it the impress of the apostolic spirit.*" *Neander*, 1 c. ii. p. 33.]

(3) *John* and *Paul* are then the prominent representatives of the dogmatic theology of primitive Christianity. Concerning the former, we have to consider beside his epistles, the introduction to his gospel, and the peculiarities before alluded to in his relation of the discourses of Christ. (On the book of Revelation, and its relation to the Gospel and the Epistles, the opinions of critics have ever been, and still are different.) While the authorship of the Gospel was for a long time ascribed to John, but not that of the Apocalypse (*Lücke*), the most recent critics have advanced the opposite opinion (*Schwegler*), and *Ebrard* has, in opposition to both, defended the genuineness of the Gospel as well as of the Epistles and the Apocalypse, [comp. *Davidson, S.*, in Kitto, l. c. sub voce.] The manifestation of God in the flesh—union with God through Christ—life from and in God—and victory over the world and sin through this life, which is a life of love—these are the fundamental doctrines propounded by John. (Comp. *Lücke's* Commentaries on his writings; *Rickli's* Predigten über den ersten Brief; *Tholuck's* and *De Wette's* Commentaries on the gospel; *Paulus* über die 3 Lehrbriefe.) [*Frommann*, l. c. *Wright, W.*, in Kitto, l. c. sub voce. *Neander*, l. c. p. 240, ss. " *Hence every thing in his view turned on one simple contrast:—Divine life in communion with the Redeemer—death in estrangement from him.*"] *Paul* differs from John materially and formally. *a. Materially:* John sets forth the principles of *theology* and *christology*, Paul those of *anthropology*, and *the doctrine of redemption;* nevertheless the writings of John are also of importance for anthropology, those of Paul for theology and christology. But the central point of John's theology is the incarnation of the Logos in Christ; the fundamental principle of the Pauline doctrine is justification by faith. *b. Formally:* Paul developes his ideas before the soul of the reader, reproduces them in him, and unfolds all the resources of dialectic art, in which traces of former rabbinical education may still be seen. John proceeds thetically and apodictically, draws the reader into the depths of mystic vision, [Germ. Anschauung; comp. *Rose*, preface to his translation of Neander's history of the church, etc. ii. p. xv. xvi.], announces

Divine things in a prophetic tone, and addresses himself more to the believing mind than to reason. John styles his readers *children*, Paul calls them his *brethren* (Comp. on the difference between Paul and John, *Staudenmaier* über Joh. Scot. Erigena, p. 220, ss.) A peculiar theological tendency is represented *in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. It is related to the Pauline doctrine with a prevailing leaning towards the typical; formally it holds the medium between the form in which Paul represents Divine truth, and the style adopted by John. [*Neander*, hist of plant. a. train. ii. p. 212—229.] (On the question respecting its author, comp. the Commentaries of *Bleek*, [*Stuart*,] *Tholuck*, [translat. into English by J. Hamilton and J. E. Ryland, Edinb. 1842. 2 vols. and *Alexander, W. L.*, in Kitto l. c. sub voce, *J. J. Gurney*, Biblical Notes, No. 1.] On the three primary Biblical forms, (the Jacobo-Petrine, the Johannine and Pauline), *see Dorner*, l. c. p. 77.

(4) The farther developement of the history of doctrines will show, how the tendency represented by *John* prevailed during the first period in relation to the doctrine of the Logos, and to christology; it was not until the second period that Augustine put the *Pauline* doctrine in the foreground.

§ 19.

CIVILIZATION OF THE AGE AND PHILOSOPHY.

Souverain über den Platonismus der Kirchenväter, mit Anmerkungen von Löffler, 2. edit. 1792. *Fichte, Im.*, de Philosophiæ novæ platonicæ origine, Berol. 1818. 8. *Ackermann*, das Christliche im Plato und in der platonischen Philosophie, Hamb. 1835. *Dähne, A. F.*, geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie, in 2 parts, Halle 1834. *Gfrörer*, Kritische Geschichte des Urchristenthums, vol. i. also under the title: Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie, 2 parts, Stuttgart 1831. *By the same:* das Jahrhundert des Heils, 2 parts. Stuttg. 1836, (zur Geschichte der Urchristenthums.) *Georgii*, über die neuesten Gegensätze in Auffassung der alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie, insbesonders des jüdischen Alexandrinismus, in *Illgens* Zeitschrift für historische Theologie, 1839. part 3. p. 1, ss. part 4. p. 1, ss. *Tennemann*, Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. vii. *Ritter*, vol. iv. *Schleiermacher*, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 154, ss.

Though the peculiar character of Christianity cannot be understood, if we consider it not so much an actual revelation of the great scheme of salvation, as a new system of philosophy, it must, on the other hand, be admitted that it adopted something already in existence, but filled it with its own spirit, and thus appropriated it to itself. This was the case especially with the oriental platonic philosophy, which had its chief seat in Alexandria, and was principally represented by *Philo*.(1) It made its first appearance in some of the New Testament writings, especially in reference to the doctrine concerning the Logos,(2) but afterwards created a considerable influence upon the speculative tendency of Christian theologians.(3)

---

(1) Comp. *Grossmann*, quæstiones Philoneæ, Lips. 1829. *Theile*, Christus und Philo, in Winer's und Engelhardt's kritische Journal, vol. 9. part 4. p. 385. *Scheffer*, quæst. Philon Sect. 2. p. 41, ss *Lücke*, Commentar zum Joh. i. p. 249. *Editions of Philo:* Turnebus (1552), Höschel (1613), the Parisian (1640), *Mangey (1742), Pfeiffer (5 vol. Erl. 1820), comp. the programme of *J. G. Müller*, Basel, 1839. 4. *Edw. von Muralt*, Untersuchungen über Philo in Beziehung auf die der (Petersburger) Akademie gehörigen Handschriften, 1840.

(2) That which was a mere abstract and ideal notion in the system of Philo, became a concrete fact in Christianity—an historical event in the sphere of real life; on this account "*it is alike contrary to historical truth, to deny the influence of the age upon the external phenomena and the didactic developement of the gospel, and to ascribe its internal origin and true nature to the age.*"—*Lücke*, l. c. Comp. *Dorner*, l. c. introd. p. 21, ss.

(3) Much of that which was formerly (from the time of *Souverain*) called "the Platonism of the Fathers," is by modern theologians restricted to this, "*that the general influence exerted by Platonism was the stronger and more definite influence of the educated part of the heathen world in general.*" *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Compendium, i. p. 67. Thus the charge of Platonism often brought forward against Justin M. is unfounded, comp. *Semisch*, Justin der M. ii. p. 227, ss. It appears more just in the case of the Alexandrian theologians, especially Origen. But in this case, as well as in reference to the partial influence exerted by Aristotelianism and Stoicism upon certain tendencies of the

age, it ought not to be overlooked, that during the present period "*philosophy appears only in connection with theology.*" *Schleiermacher*, l. c. p. 154; comp. also *Redepenning*, Origines (Bonn 1841.) vol. i. p. 91, ss.

§ 20.

RULE OF FAITH—THE APOSTLES' CREED.

Marheinecke*, Ursprung und Entwickelung der Orthodoxie und Heterodoxie in der ersten 3 Jahrhunderten (in Daub und Creuzers Studien, Heidelb. 1807. vol. iii. p. 96, ss. †*Möhler*, Einheit der Kirche oder Princip des Katholicismus im Geiste der Kirchenväter der ersten 3 Jahrhundorte, Tüb. 1825. *Vossius, J. G.*, de tribus symbolis, Dissertt. iii. Amstel. 1701. fol. *King, Lord*, History of the Apostles' Creed, with critical observations, 5. edit. Lond. 1738. (Latin translation by *Olearius*, Lips. 1706. Bas. 1768.) *Ruddelbach*, die Bedeutung des Apostol. Symbolums, Lpz. 1844. *Stockmeier, J.*, über Entstehung des Apostolischen Symbolums, Zur. 1846. [Bishop ***Pearson* on the Apostles' Creed. ***Witsius, H.***, Dissertations on what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed. Transl. from the Latin by *D. Fraser*, Edinb. 1823. Dissert. i.—*Heylyn, P.*, The Summe of Christian Theology, contained in the Apostles' Creed. Lond. 1673. fol.—*Barrow, J.*, Exposition of the Creed, (Theolog. works, vol. v.) Oxf. 1838. Sect. 1.]

Before scientific theology developed itself by the aid of philosophical speculation as γνῶσις, the teaching of the Apostles had been historically established as a simple rule of faith (πίστις, Acts vi. 7.) This was accomplished by putting together those elements (στοιχεῖα) of Christian doctrine, which were accounted essential. The κήρυγμα ἀποστολικόν the παράδοσις ἀποστολική was first transmitted by oral tradition, and afterwards appeared in a written form.(1) What is commonly called the Apostles' Creed (apostolic symbol), is most probably composed of various confessions of faith, used by the primitive church in baptismal services. Though it did not proceed from the Apostles themselves, yet it substantially preserved the principles of apostolic tradition.(2)

(1) Comp. the rules of faith of Irenæus, adv. hæret. i. c. 10.

(*Grabe*, c. 2.) *Tertull.* de virgin. vel. c. 1. de præscript. Hær. c. 13. advers. Prax. c. 2. *Orig.* de præscript. proœm. § 4. *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, i. 16—19. On the use of tradition and its relation to Holy Scripture comp. below § 33 and 37.

(2) The tradition of its apostolic origin, mentioned by Rufinus exposit. symb. apost. (in Baron. annal. a. 44. No. 14. [*Witsius*, l. c. p. 3.], was doubted first by Laur. Valla, and afterwards by Erasmus; some of the earlier Protestants however, *e. g.* the Magdeb. Centur. (Cent I. l. 2. p. 66.) still attached credit to it.—Comp. *Basnage*, Exercitationes histor. crit. ad a. 44. No. 17. *Buddei*, Isagoge, p. 441. where the literature is given. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. 2. p. 535. [trans. by *Rose*, i. p. 351.] *Marheinecke*, l. c. p. 160. [*Heylyn*, l. c. p. 8, ss. *Barrow*, l. c. 218, 219.]

§ 21.

HERESIES.

Ittig, *Th.* de hæresiarchis ævi apostolici. Lips. 1690, 1703. 4. [*Burton Edw.*, Theolog. Works, vol. iii. The Bampton Lecture on the Heresies of the Apostolic age. Oxf. 1837. Comp. the introduction where the literature is given.]

Every departure from the apostolic Canon was considered (in opposition to the Catholic church) as αἵρεσις (Germ. Irrlehre, Ketzerei; Engl. heresy).(1) So early as the apostolic age we find false teachers, some of whom are mentioned in the New Testament itself,(2) others in the works of early ecclesiastical writers.(3) Concerning their personal history and doctrine many points are still involved in obscurity, which, in the absence of trustworthy historical evidence, cannot easily and satisfactorily be cleared up.

(1) Αἵρεσις (from αἱρεῖσθαι) and σχίσμα were primarily synonymous terms, (1 Cor. xi. 18, 19.), but in later times the one was used to denote a departure from the true faith, the other to designate a disruption which took place in consequence of differences of opinion concerning liturgy, discipline, or ecclesiastical polity. The word αἵρεσις was not originally employed in a bad sense, it

is vox media; comp. Acts v. 17: xv. 5; xxvi. 5. [*Burton*, l. c. p. 8.] Ecclesiastical writers themselves call Christianity a *sect*, (Tertull. Apol. i. 1, and in many other places), and even Constantine gives the Catholic church the name αἵρεσις (Euseb. x. c. 5.) On the contrary, in Gal. v. 20. the same term is used in connection with ἐριθεῖαι, διχοστασίαι, etc. comp. 2 Pet. ii. 1. (ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι.) Synonymous terms are: ἑτεροδιδασκαλία, 1 Tim. i. 3; vi. 3; ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις, ch. vi. 20; ματαιολογία, ch. i. 6; the adject. αἱρετικός, Tit. iii. 10. Comp. *Wetstein*, N. T. ii. 147. *Suicer* Thesaurus sub voce. On the various etymologies of the German word *Ketzer* (ital. Gazzari, whether from καθαρός, or from the Chazares—like *bougre* from the Bulgares?) comp. *Mosheim*, unparteiische und gründliche Ketzergeschichte, Helmst. 1746. p. 357, ss. and *Wackernagel*, altdeutsches Lesebuch, p. 1675. On the scientific use of heresies, *Orig*. Hom. 9. in Num. opp. T. ii. p. 296, says: Nam si doctrina ecclesiastica simplex esset et nullis intrinsecus hæreticorum dogmatum assertionibus cingeretur, non poterat tam clara et tam examinata videri fides nostra. Sed idcirco doctrinam catholicam contradicentium obsidet oppugnatio: *ut fides nostra non otio torpescat sed exercitiis elimetur*. Comp. *August*. de civit. D. xviii. c. 51.

(2) On the different parties in the Church of Corinth, (which, however caused only schisms *in*, but not separations *from* the congregation,) comp. *Schenkel, Dan*. de Ecclesia Corinthia primæva factionibus turbata, Bas. 1838. *F. Ch. Baur*, die Christuspartie. [*Neander*, history of the plant. and train. i. p. 268—282. *Billroth*, Comment on the Corinth. transl. by *Alexander*, i. p. 11. *Alexander*, *W. L*. in Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. sub voce.]—With respect to the heretics mentioned in the N. T. the attention of critics has chiefly been directed to those alluded to in the Epistle to the Colossians, and in the pastoral epistles. Concerning the former, (were they theosophical Essenes, or Jewish Christians?) comp. *Schneckenburger* in the appendix to his treatise über die Proselytentaufe, p. 213. *Böhmer*, Isagoge in Epist. a Paulo ad Coloss. datam, 1829. p. 131. *Neander*, Apostolische Gesch. vol. ii. [history of the plant. and train. i. p 374—381. *Alexander, W. L.*, in Kitto, l. c. sub voce.] Among the latter *Hymenæus* and *Philetus* only are mentioned by name, as denying the doctrine of resurrection, 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18. [*Burton*, l. c. p. 135, ss. *Ryland, J. E.*, in Kitto, l. c. sub voce.] But the inquiry relative to the character of these heretics is in-

timately connected with the critical examination of the genuineness of the epistles themselves. Comp. *Baur, F. Ch.*, die sogenanten Pastoralbriefe, des Apostels Paulus, aufs Neue kritisch untersucht, Stuttg. 1835. On the other side: *Baumgarten, Mich.*, die Aechtheit der Pastoralbriefe, Berlin, 1837; comp. also the reply of Baur in his treatise: Ueber die Ursprung des Episcopats, Tüb. 1838, p. 14, ss. Comp. also *Schwegler*, l. c. and *Dietlein*, Urchristenthum. [*Alexander, W. L.*, in Kitto l. c. art. Timothy, Titus, *C. E. Scharling*, die neuesten Untersuchungen über die sogenanten Pastoralbriefe. Aus dem Dänischen übersetzt, Jena, 1846.] Concerning the *Nicolaitans*, Rev. ii. 6, 15, and those that hold the doctrine of Balaam, Rev. ii. 14, (comp. Iren. i. 26. and the erroneous derivation from Nicolas, Acts vi. 5.) see the Commentaries on the Book of Revelation, [comp. *Davidson, S.*, in Kitto l. c.] (Ewald, p. 110.) *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. 2. p. 774, ss. [transl. by *Rose*, ii. 116.—History of the plant. and train. ii. 50. *Burton*, l. c. Lect. v. p. 145, ss.—*Lee, R.*, in Kitto l. c. *Stuart*, Comm. on the Apoc. II. p. 62, ss.]

(3) The heresiarch *Simon Magus*, who is described in the N. T. (Acts viii.) as a man of an immoral character, but not as a heretic, is nevertheless represented by Clem. Al. (Strom. ii. 11. vii. 17.) and Orig. (contra Cels. i. p. 57.) as the founder of a sect; by Irenæus (adv. Hær. i. 23. 24.) and Epiphanius, (Hær. 21.) even as the author of all heresies. Concerning his adventures and disputation with Peter, many fictitious stories were current among the earlier writers, (see the Clementine Homilies, and Justin M. Apol. 1. c. 56.)—On Simon Magus and the two Samaritans *Dositheus* and *Menander*, (Euseb. iii. 26.) comp. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. 2. p. 779. [trans by *Rose*, ii. p. 118. Hist. of the plant. a. train. i. 67—74.—*Burton*, l. c. Lect. iv. p. 87—118, and note 40; *by the same:* Lectures on the ecclesiast. hist. of the first cent., p. 77, ss. *Gieseler*, l. c. i. § 18. note 8, where the literature is given. *Alexander, W. L.*, in Kitto l. c.] *Marheinecke* in Daub's Studien, l. c p. 116.) *Dorner* says, l. c. p. 144:—"*The accounts given of Simon Magus, Menander, and Doritheus, who have become almost mythical persons, prove at least that in Syria Gnostic tendencies made their appearance at an early period.*" The assertion of Hegesippus ap. Euseb. iii. 32, that the church had not been stained with any heresy previous to the time of Trajan (παρθένος καθαρὰ καὶ ἀδιάφθορος ἔμεινεν ἡ ἐκκλησία), is not to be

understood, as if no heresies had existed at all, but that, till the death of Simeon (A.D. 108.), the church had not been infected with the poison of heresies.

§ 22.

JUDAISM AND ETHNICISM.

There were two errors against which the new religion had to guard, lest it should lose its peculiar religious features, and disappear in another religion already in existence: against a relapse into Judaism on the one side, and against a mixture with paganism, with speculation borrowed from it, and with a mythologizing tendency on the other. Accordingly the earliest heresies of which we have any trustworthy account, appear either as *judaizing*, or as *ethnizing* (hellenizing) tendencies. But as Jewish and Pagan elements were blended with each other about the rise of Christianity, manifold modifications and transitions from the one to the other might take place.

Concerning the different forms of heathenism (occidental and oriental), as well as the earlier and later periods of the Jewish dispensation, comp. *Dorner*, Entwickelungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi, p. 4, ss.

§ 23.

EBIONITES AND CERINTHUS—DOCETÆ AND GNOSTICS.

Gieseler, von den Nazaräern und Ebioniten, in Stäudlins und Tzschirners Archiv. vol. iv. st. 2. *Credner*, über Essäer und Ebioniten und einem theilweisen Zusammenhange derselben. (in Winers Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1827. parts 2. a. 3.) *Lange*, *Lobeg.*, Beiträge zur ältern Kirchengeschichte, Leipzig, 1826. 1st vol. *Baur*, de Ebionitarum origine et doctrina ab Essenis repetenda, Tüb. 1831. *Schneckenburger*, Beiträge zur Einleitung ins Neue Testament, Stuttg. 1832. *A. Schliemann*, die Clementinen nebst den verwandten Schriften und der Ebionitismus, ein Beitrag zur Kirchen-und Dogmengeschichte der ersten Jahrhunderte, Hamb. 1841. *Schmidt*, Cerinth, ein judaisirender Christ, in his Bibliotheck für Kritik und Exegetik, vol. i. p. 181, ss. *Paulus*, historia Cerinthi, in Introductio in N. Test. capit. selectiora, Jen. 1799. *Niemeyer, A. H.*, de Docetis. Hal. 1823. 4. *Lewald*, de doctrina gnostica, Heidelberg, 1819. *Lücke, F.*, in der theologischen Zeitschrift, Berlin, 1820. part 2. p. 132. **Neander*, genet. Entwicklung der vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme, Berlin, 1818. *Matter*, histoire critique du Gnosticisme, Paris, 1828. ii. **Baur*, christliche Gnosis, oder die christliche Religionsphilosophie in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung, Tüb. 1835. Comp. the works on ecclesiast. hist. by *Gieseler*, i. § 43, ss. *Neander*, i. p. 414. *Hase*, p. 90, ss. *Schleiermacher*, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 160–65. [*Neander*, transl. of *Rose*, ii. p. 9–140. *Burton*, Bampton Lecture, Lect. ii. to be comp. with *Potter, J.*, in Kitto, Cyclop. of Biblic. Liter. Art. Gnosticism. *Norton, A.*, on the Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. ii. a. iii. 1844.]

The judaizing tendency was chiefly represented by the *Ebionites*,(1) of whom the *Nazarenes*(2) were a species more nearly approaching the orthodox faith, and with whom other judaizing sects of a more indefinite character were connected.(3) *Cerinthus*(4) also adopted this tendency, and formed the transition to that form of Judaism blended with heathen Gnosis, which we find represented in the *Clementine Homilies*.(5) A strict contrast with the Jewish-Ebionitic tendency manifested itself first in the *Docetæ*,(6) and, secondly, the various sects of the *Gnostics*.(7) Of the latter some were more strongly opposed to Judaism than others,(8) some even returned to Ebionitic errors,(9) while *Marcion*, who occupied a peculiar position, endeavoured to go beyond the contrast between Judaism and Ethnicism, but, despising all historical foundation, established a purely imaginary system of Christianity.(10)

(1) On the derivation of Ebionites from אֶבְיוֹן, and their history, comp. *Orig.* contra Celsum II. towards the commencement; *Irenæus* adv. Hær. I. 26. *Tert.* præscr. Hær. 33. de carne Christi, c. 14. *Euseb.* iv. 27. *Epiph.* Hær. 29. 30. *Hieron.* in Matth viii. 9; xix. 20. in Iesai. xiii. Cat. script. eccles. c. 3. and the works on ecclesiast. history. [*Neander*, transl. ii. 9, ss. *Burton*, l. c. Lect. vi. p. 183, ss.] Different opinions are entertained as to the origin of the Ebionites; *Schliemann*, p. 459, ss. (according to Hegesippus in Euseb. III. 32. and IV. 22.) dates

it back as far as the death of Simeon of Jerusalem. According to the theologians of the school of Tübingen, [the founder of which is *F. Ch. Baur*, among whose disciples we may mention *Zeller, Schwegler, Ritschel,* etc.], Ebionitism is as old as Christianity, Christ himself was an Ebionite, and Paul first went beyond Ebionitism. The judaizing tendency which was firmly established in Ebionitism, may indeed be traced to primitive Christianity ; not all Christians were, like Paul, able to comprehend the universal design of their religion. But this judaizing tendency for some time existed along with the Pauline as a more imperfect form of Christianity, without being regarded as heresy. But, having once been surpassed by the more liberal tendency of the Pauline doctrine, it must either gradually disappear (its adherents forming a Jewish sect), or be blended with other Gnostic elements, (this was the case with the Ebionitism of the Clementine Homilies, comp. note 5.) The former kind of Ebionitism has been called "vulgar (common) Ebionitism." Its adherents were characterized by their narrow attachment to Jewish tradition, which sought to impose the yoke of the law upon Christians, and prevented them from forming a higher idea of Christ than that involved in the Jewish conception of the Messiah. Accordingly, when they regarded Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary, this opinion did not proceed (as in the case of the Artemonites, § 24.) from a rationalistic source, but had its root in their spiritual poverty and narrow-mindedness. With their Jewish notions concerning the law and the Messiah would accord the sensual, millennial expectations of which Jerome (l. c. but no other writer) accuses them.

(2) *Origen* (contra Cels. v. Opp. i. p. 625.) mentions two different kinds of Ebionites, of whom the one class approached the orthodox doctrine of the church more nearly than the other. These more moderate Ebionites are perhaps the same, to whom Jerome and Epiph. give the name *Nazarenes*, which was formerly applied to all Christians. They taught that the law (circumcision in particular) was obligatory on Jewish Christians only, and believed Jesus to be the son of the Virgin Mary, but a mere man; of course they rejected his pre-existence. Comp. the treatise of *Gieseler*, l. c. [*Burton*, l. c. p. 184.] The most recent researches (of *Schliemann*,) however, shew that the Nazarenes were never brought together into the same class with the Ebionites, but that Origen made a distinction between the common

and the Gnostic Ebionites (comp. note 5.) Different are the opinions of *Schwegler*, nachapostolische Zeitalter, p. 179, ss. and *Dorner*, l. c. 301, ss.

(3) *Elkesaites*, *Sampsæi*, etc. Epiph. Hær. 19. 1—30. 3. 17. Euseb. iv.) "*It seems impossible, accurately to distinguish these different Jewish sects, which perhaps were only different grades of the order of the Essenes, assisted as we are, merely by the confused reminiscences of the fourth century.*" (Hase, l. c. p. 7. 90.)

(4) Iren. i. 26. Euseb. h. e. iii. 28. (according to Caius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria) Epiph. Hær. 28. comp. *Olshausen*, hist. eccles. veteris monumenta præcipua, vol. i. p. 223-25. [*Burton*, l. c. Lect. vi. p. 174, ss.] It appears from Irenæus, that the sentiments of Cerinthus are allied to Gnosticism, as he maintains that the world was not created by the supreme God, and that the Æon Christ had descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism. He denies, however, in common with the Ebionites that Christ was born of the virgin, but on different, viz. rationalistic grounds (*impossible enim hoc ei visum est.*) According to the accounts given by Eusebius his principal error consisted in gross millennarianism. Comp. the treatises of *Paulus* and *Schmid*, and on the remarkable, but not inexplicable mixture of Judaism and Gnosticism : *Baur*, Gnosis, p.404. 405. *Dorner*, l. c. p. 310, mentions a peculiar class of Cerinthian Ebionites, who, in his opinion, form the transition to the Clementine Homilies.

(5) As Cerinthus is said to have blended Gnostic elements with Jewish notions, so did one section of the Ebionites, who are related to have had their foundation in the Clementine Homilies (*i. e.* homilies of the Apostle Peter, which are said to have been written down by Clement of Rome) Comp. *Neander's* Appendix to his work on the Gnostic systems, and Kirchengesch. i. 2. p.619, 20. [transl. ii. p.14, 15. *Lardner, N.*, Works, ii. 376, 377. *Norton* l. c. ii. note B. p. xxiii.—xxxvii.] *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 403. and app. p. 760, and his aforesaid programme. *Schenkel*, however, has broached a different opinion in his Dissert. (mentioned § 21. note 2.), according to which the Clementine tendency would belong, not to the judaizing, but to the rationalizing, monarchian tendency which was spread in Rome (comp. *Lücke's* review in the Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeiger 1839, parts 50 and 51.) Dorner, l. c. p. 324, ss. gives a very accurate description of this tendency, which passes over from Judaism into Paganism.

(6) The Docetæ whom Ignatius ad Eph. 7. 18. ad Smyrn. c. 1—8, already opposed, and probably even the Apostle John (1 John i. 1—3; iv. 2, ss. 2 John vii.) (on the question whether he also alludes to them in the prologue to his gospel, comp. *Lücke* l. c.) may be considered as the forerunners of the Gnostics. [*Burton* l. c. Lect. vi. p. 158, ss.] They form the most decided contrast with the Ebionites, inasmuch as they not only maintain (in opposition to them) the divinity of Christ, but also merge his human nature, to which the Ebionites exclusively confined themselves, in a mere phantom (by denying that he possessed a *real* body.) Ebionitism (Nazareism) and Docetism form, according to *Schleiermacher* (Glaubenslehre, vol. i. p. 124.), *natural* heresies, and complete each other, as far as this can be the case with one-sided opinions; but they quite as easily pass over from the one to the other. Comp. *Dorner*, Geschichte der Christologie, p. 349, ss.

(7) Like Docetism in the doctrine concerning Christ alone, so the more completely developed system of Gnosticism proceeds in its entire tendency to that other extreme which is opposed to judaizing Ebionitism. It not only contains some of the elements of Docetism (comp. the christology in the special history of doctrines), but in its relation to the Old Test. it possesses a character more or less antinomian, and in its eschatology is adverse to millennarianism. It opposes the spirit to the letter, the ideal to the real. To change history into myths, to dissipate positive doctrines in speculation, and therefore to distinguish between those who only believe, and those who know, to overrate *knowledge* (γνῶσις) in religion,—these are the principal features of Gnosticism. On the different usages of γνῶσις in a good, and a bad sense (γνῶσις ψευδώνυμος), γνωστής, γνωστικός, comp. *Suicer*, Thesaurus. *Sources:* Irenæus adv. Hær. (i. 29. ii.) Tertullian adv. Marcion. lib. v. adv. Valentinianos. Scorpiaca contra Gnosticos. Clem. Al. Strom. in different places, especially lib. ii. iii. vi. Euseb. iv.

The different classifications of the Gnostics according to the degree of their opposition to Judaism (*Neander*), according to countries, and the preponderance of dualism, or emanation, Syrian and Egyptian Gnostics (*Gieseler*), Gnostics of Asia Minor, Syrian, Roman and Egyptian Gnostics (*Matter*), or lastly, Hellenistic, Syrian and Christian (?) Gnostics (*Hase*), present, all of them, greater or less difficulties, and require additional classes (thus the Eclectic sect of Neander, and the Marcionites of Gieseler.) But *Baur* justly remarks that the mere classification according to countries is too external (Gnosis p. 106), and directs attention to the position on which Neander's classification is based, as the only correct one, "*because it has regard not only to one subordinate principle, but to a fundamental relation which pervades the whole.*" The particular objections to the divisions of Neander see ibidem. The three essential forms into which Gnosticism may be divided, according to Baur, are: 1. The *Valentinian,* which admits the claims of Paganism, together with Judaism and Christianity. 2. The *Marcionite,* which refers especially to Christianity; and, 3. the *Pseudo-Clementine,* which espouses the cause of Judaism in particular; see p. 120. But respecting the latter, it is yet doubtful whether it should be reckoned among the Gnostic tendencies. The essential feature of Gnosticism is its leaning towards Paganism, though it may return to Judaism in the same manner in which Judaizers may fall into the opposite error. "*Common to all Gnostic sects is their opposition against a mere empirical faith with which they charge the church, as being founded on authority alone.*" *Dorner,* p. 353. Concerning the history of doctrines, it is sufficient to glance at their principal tenets, and the relation in which they stand to the Catholic church; further particulars will be found in the special history of heresies (comp. § 6), and in the history of the particular systems of *Basilides,* (A. D. 125—140), *Valentinus* (140—160), the *Ophites, Carpocrates,* and *Epiphanes, Saturninus, Cerdo, Marcion* (150), *Bardesanes* (170), etc.

(9) Comp. *Dorner,* l. l. p. 391, ss.

(10) Ibid. p. 381, ss.

§ 24.

MONTANISM AND EARLIEST MONARCHIANISM.

Wernsdorf, de Montanistis, Gedani, 1751, 4. *Kirchner,* de Montanistis, Jen. 1832. **Heinichen,* de Alogis, Theodotianis, Artemonitis, Lips. 1829. *Schwegler, F. C. A.,* der montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts, Tüb. 1841–8. [*Neander,* Hist. of the Church, transl. by Rose, ii. 172–194.]

The relation in which Christianity stood to the world, gave rise to another contrast besides the one which existed between the judaizing and ethnizing tendencies. In the establishment of the peculiar doctrines and rites of the religion of Christ, different questions necessarily arose concerning the relation of Christianity both to former historical forms of religion, and to the nature of man and his capacities in general. Thus it might easily happen that speculative minds would fall into two opposite errors. On the one hand, an eccentric supranaturalism would manifest itself, which, passing the boundaries of revealed religion, conceived the true nature of inspiration to consist in still continued, extraordinary emotions, and endeavoured to keep up a permanent disagreement between the natural and the supernatural. This is seen in what is called *Montanism*,(1) which took its rise in Phrygia. On the other hand, an attempt would be made to fill the gulf between the natural and the supernatural, which, by explaining the wonders and mysteries of faith, and adapting them to the understanding, might lead to critico-sceptical rationalism. This is apparent in the case of the first *Monarchians* (Alogi ?)(2) whose representatives in the first period are *Theodotus* and *Artemon*.(3) The Monarchians, *Praxeas*, *Noëtus*, and *Beryllus*,(4) commonly styled Patripassians, differ from the preceding in more profound views on religion, and form the transition to Sabellianism, which will come before us in the following period.

(1) *Montanus* of Phrygia (in which country the enthusiastic worship of Cybele had been prevalent from a very early period) made his first appearance as prophet (Paraclete) about the year 170 in Ardaban, on the frontiers of Phrygia and Mysia, and afterwards in Pepuza. He distinguished himself more by an enthusiastic and eccentric character, than by any particular dogmatic heresy, so that he became the forerunner of all the extravagances which pervade the history of the church.—“*If any doctrine was dangerous to Christianity, it was that of Montanus. Though only distinguished for external morality, and agreeing with the Catholic church in all her doctrines, he never-*

theless attacked the fundamental principle of orthodoxy. For he regarded Christianity, not as complete, but as affording room for further revelations which, in his view, were even demanded and announced in the promised Paraclete." *Marheinecke* (in Daub and Creuzer's Studien,) p. 150. There he also points out the contradiction in which the positive Tertullian involved himself by joining this sect. Millennarianism, which the Montanists professed, was in accordance with their carnally spiritual tendency. In this respect they were allied to the Ebionites, (*Schwegler*). But notwithstanding their anti-gnostic tendencies, they agreed with the Gnostics in going beyond the simple faith of the church; there was, however, this difference, that the eccentric views of the Motanists had reference not so much to speculation as to practical Christianity. This sect (called also Cataphrygians, Pepuzians) existed down to the sixth century, though repeatedly condemned by ecclesiastical synods. *Sources:* Euseb. (following Apollonius), v. 18. Epiph. Hær. 48. and *Neander,* Kirchengesch. ii. 3. p. 871, ss.

(2) This term occurs in Epiph. Hær. 51. as a somewhat ambiguous paranomasia on the word Logos, (men void of understanding notwithstanding their understanding), because they rejected the doctrine concerning the Logos, and the Gospel of John in which it is principally set forth, as well as the book of Revelation, and the millennarian notions chiefly founded on it. It may be generalized in the dogmatic usage, so as to be applied to all *those* who rejected the idea of the Logos, or so misunderstood it, as either to regard Christ as a mere man, or, if they ascribed a divine nature to Christ, to identify it with that of the Father. It is difficult to decide to which of these two classes the Alogi mentioned by Epiphanius belong, comp. *Heinichen,* l. c.; on the other hand, *Dorner*, p. 500, defends them against the charge of having denied Christ's divinity. At all events, we must not lose sight of these two classes of Monarchians, (comp. *Neander,* Kirchengesch. 1. 3. p. 990, ss. Antignosticus, p. 474. *Schwegler,* Montanismus, p. 268), though it is difficult to make a precise distinction between the one and the other.

(3) *Theodotus*, a worker in leather (ὁ σκυτεὺς) from Byzantium, who resided at Rome about the year 200, maintained the mere humanity of Christ, and was accordingly excommunicated by the Roman bishop Victor, Euseb. v. 28. Theodoret, Fab. Hær. ii. 5. Epiph. Hæret. 54. (ἀπόσπασμα τῆς 'Αλόγου αἱρέσεως). He

L.I.F.E. College Librar
1100 Glendale Blvd

must not be confounded with another Theodotus (τραπεζίτης), who was connected with a party of the Gnostics, the Melchisedekites. Theodor. fab. Hær. II. 6. *Dorner*, p. 505, ss. *Artemon*, (Artemas) charged the successor of Victor, the Roman bishop Zephyrinus, with having corrupted the doctrine of the church, and secretly brought in the doctrine of the divinity of Christ. Comp. *Neander*, l. c. p. 998. [transl. ii. p. 262. 263.] *Heinichen*, l. c. p. 26, 27. [*Burton*, Lectures on the ecclesiast. hist. of the second and third cent., (Works, vol. v.) p. 211, ss. 236, ss. 265, ss. 387, and Bampton Lect. notes 100 and 101.] The prevailing rationalistic tendency of this sect (Pseudo-rationalism) may be seen from Euseb. l. c. (*Heinichen*, p. 139.) Οὐ τί αἱ θεῖαι λέγουσι γραφαὶ ζητοῦντες, ἀλλ᾽ ὁποῖον σχῆμα συλλογισμοῦ εἰς τὴν τῆς ἀθεότητος εὑρεθῇ σύστασιν, φιλοπόνως ἀσκοῦντες . . . . καταλιπόντες δὲ τὰς ἁγίας τοῦ θεοῦ γραφὰς, γεωμετρίαν ἐπιτηδεύουσιν, ὡς ἂν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ὄντες καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενον ἀγνοοῦντες. The homage they rendered to Euclid, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Galen, ὃς ἴσως ὑπό τινων καὶ προςκυνεῖται.

(4) *Praxeas*, from Asia Minor, had gained under Marcus Aurelius the reputation of a professing Christian, but being charged by Tertullian with Patripassianism, was combated by him. Tertull. advers. Praxeam, lib. II.—*Noëtus*, at Smyrna, about the year 230, was opposed by Hippolytus on account of similar errors. Hippol. contra Hæresin Noëti. Theodoret, Fab. Hær. iii. 3. Epiph. Hær. 57.—As to *Beryllus*, bishop of Bostra in Arabia, whom Origen compelled to recant, Euseb. vi. 33. comp. *Ullmann*, de Beryllo Bostreno, Hamb. 1835. 4. Studien und Kritiken, 1836, part 4, p. 1073. (comp. § 42, and 46.) [Praxeas in *Neander*, l. c. transl. ii. 260, ss.—*Burton*, l. c. p. 221, ss. 234, ss. Noëtus in *Neander*, l. c. p. 262. *Burton*, l. c. p. 312, 364.—Beryllus in *Neander*, l. c. p. 273, ss. *Burton*, l. c. p. 312, 313.]

§ 25.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE.

The Catholic doctrine (1) developed itself in opposition to the aforesaid heresies. But though the orthodox theologians endeavoured to avoid heretical errors, and to preserve the foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles by firmly adhering to the pure faith which had been delivered to them by the Fathers, yet they could not make themselves wholly free from the influence which the civilization of the age, the intellectual faculties of individuals, and the preponderating disposition of the public mind, have ever exerted upon the formation of religious ideas and notions. On this account we find in the Catholic church the same contrasts, or at least the same diversities and modifications as among the heretics, though they manifest themselves in a milder and less offensive form. Thus we perceive on the one hand a firm, sometimes narrow-minded adherence to external rites and historical tradition, which was akin to legal judaism, (positive tendency), combined in some cases, as in that of Tertullian, with the Montanist tendency. On the other, we see some theologians exhibiting a more free and comprehensive disposition of mind, who sometimes in a more idealistico-speculative manner followed the Gnostic doctrine, (*true* gnosis contrasted with false gnosis), sometimes adopted critico-rationalistic elements which were allied to the Monarchian principles, though not identical with them.(2)

(1) On the term *catholic* in opposition to *heretic*, see *Suicer*, Thesaurus, sub voce καθολικός. comp. ὀρθόδοξος. ὀρθοδοξία. *Bingham*, Origg. eccles. i. 1. sect. 7. *Vales.* ad Euseb. vii. 10. Tom. ii. p. 333: Ut vera et genuina Christi ecclesia ab adulterinis Hæreticorum cœtibus distingueretur, *catholicæ* cognomen soli Orthodoxorum ecclesiæ attributum est.—Concerning the negative and practical, rather than theoretical character of earlier orthodoxy, see *Marheinecke* (in Daub und Creuzer) l. c. p. 140, ss.

(2) This was the case, e. g. with *Origen*, who now and then shows sober reasoning along with Gnostic speculation.—On the manner in which the philosophizing Fathers knew how to reconcile gnosis with paradosis (disciplina arcani), comp. *Marheinecke*, l. c. p. 170.

§ 26.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE FATHERS.

Steiger, de la foi de l'église primitive d'après les écrits des premiers pères, in les Melanges de Théologie reformée, edited by himself and Hävernick, Paris 1833. 1er cahier. [*Bennet, J.*, the Theology of the Early Christian Church, exhibited in quotations from the writers of the first three centuries. Lond. 1842.] *Dorner*, l. c., *Schwegler*, nachapostolisches Zeitalter.

While the so-called Apostolical Fathers (with few exceptions) were distinguished by a direct practico-ascetical rather than a definite dogmatic activity,(1) the philosophizing tendency allied to Hellenism was in some measure represented by the apologists *Justin Martyr*,(2) *Tatian*,(3) *Athenagoras*,(4) *Theophilus* of Antioch,(5) and *Minucius Felix*(6) in the West. On the contrary *Irenæus*,(7) as well as *Tertullian*,(8) and his disciple *Cyprian*,(9) firmly adhered to the positive dogmatic theology and realistic notions of the church, the former in a milder and more considerate, the latter in a strict, sometimes gloomy manner. *Clement*(10) and *Origen*(11) both belonging to the Alexandrian school, chiefly developed the speculative aspect of theology. But these contrasts are only relative; for we find, *e. g.* that Justin Martyr manifests both a leaning towards Hellenism, and a strong Judaizing tendency; that the idealism and criticism of Origen are now and then accompanied with a surprizing adherence to the letter, and that Tertullian, notwithstanding his antignostic tendency, evidently strives after philosophical ideas.

(1) The name *Patres apostolici* is given to the Fathers of the first century, who according to tradition were disciples of the Apostles. Concerning their personal history and writings much room is left to conjecture. [On their writings in general, we subjoin the following remarks of Neander: " *The remarkable*

difference between the writings of the Apostles and those of the Apostolical Fathers, who are yet so close upon the former in point of time, is a remarkable phenomenon of its kind. While in other cases such a transition is usually quite gradual, in this case we find a sudden one. Here there is no gradual transition but a sudden spring; a remark which is calculated to lead us to a recognition of the peculiar activity of the Divine Spirit in the souls of the Apostles. The time of the first extraordinary operations of the Holy Spirit was followed by the time of the free developement of human nature in Christianity; and here, as elsewhere, the operations of Christianity must necessarily be confined, before it could penetrate farther, and appropriate to itself the higher intellectual powers of man."—Hist. of the Ch. transl. ii. 329.] The following are called Apostolical Fathers:

1. *Barnabas,* known as the fellow-labourer of the Apostle Paul from Acts iv. 36, (Joses); ix. 27, etc. On the epistle ascribed to him, in which a strong tendency manifests itself to typical and allegorical interpretations—though in a very different spirit from, *e. g.* the canonical Epistle to the Hebrews—comp. *Henke, Ern.*, de epistolæ quæ Barnabæ tribuitur authentia, Jenæ, 1827. *Rördam,* de authent. epist. Barnab. Hafn. 1828, (in favour of its genuineness.) *Ullmann,* Studien und Kritiken, 1828, part 2. *Hug,* Zeitschrift für das Erzbisth. Freiburg, part 2, p. 132, ss. part 3, p. 208, ss. *Twesten,* Dogmatik, i. p. 101. *Neander,* Kirchengesch. i. 3. p. 1100, [transl. ii. p. 330.] *against* it: "*a very different spirit breathes throughout it from that of an apostolical writer.*" *Bleek.* Einleitung in den Brief an die Hebräer, p. 416, note (undecided.) *Schenkel,* in the Studien u. Kritiken, x. p. 652, (adopting a middle course, and considering one part as genuine and another as interpolated), and on the other side [*Hefele, C. T.*, Das Sendschreiben des Apostels Barnabas aufs Neue untersucht, übersetzt und erklärt. Tüb. 1840.—*Lardner, N.*, Works, II. p. 17—20; iv. 105—108; v. 269—275, (*for* its authenticity.) *Cave, W.*, Lives of the most eminent Fathers of the church. Oxf. 1840, i. p. 90—105. *Burton.* Lect. on the ecclesiast. history of the first cent. (Works, iv. p. 164, 343, (*against* it.) *Davidson, S*, Sacred Hermeneutics, Edinb.1843, p. 71, (*for* it.) *Ryland, J. E.*, in Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Liter. art. Barnabas (*against* it.)]

2. *Hermas,* (Rom. xvi. 14,) whose ποιμήν (shepherd) in the form of visions enjoyed a high reputation in the second half of the second century, and was even quoted as a part of Scripture. Some critics ascribe the work in question to a later Hermas, (Hermes), brother of the Roman bishop, Pius I, who lived about the year 150. Comp. *Gratz,* Disqu. in Past. Herm. Part I. Bonn 1820. 4. *Jachmann,* der Hirte des Hermas. Konigsb. 1835. [*Neander,* l. c. p. 333. *Lardner,* iv. 97, 98, etc. *Ryland, J. E.,* in Kitto, l. c. *Stuart,* Comment. on the Apocalypse, I. p. 113—121, where an outline of the whole work is given.]
3. *Clement of Rome* (according to some the fellow-labourer of Paul, mentioned Phil. iv. 3,) one of the earliest bishops of Rome, (Iren. iii. 3. 3. Euseb. iii. 2. 13. a. 15.) His first epistle to the Corinthians is of dogmatic importance in relation to the doctrine of the resurrection. The so-called second epistle is a fragment which owes its origin probably to some unknown author, [*Lardner,* l. c. ii. 33–35.] Comp. also *Schneckenburger,* Evangel. der Aegypter, p. 3. 13, ss. 28, ss. *Schwegler,* Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, p. 449; on the other side, *Dorner,* p. 143. In the dogmatic point of view, those writings would be of greatest importance, which are now generally considered as supposititious, viz. the Clementine Homilies (ὁμιλίαι Κλήμεντος), the Recognitiones Clementis (ἀναγνωρισμοί), the Constitutiones apostolicæ, and the Canones apostolici; on the latter comp. *Krabbe,* über den Ursprung und Inhalt der apostol. Constit. des Clem. Rom. Hamb. 1829; and † *Drey,* neue Untersuchungen über die Constitutiones und Canones der Apostel, Tüb. 1832. [*Neander,* l. c. p. 331–333. *Lardner,* ii. p. 29–35; 364–378. *Burton,* l. c. 342–344. *Ryland, J. E.,* in Kitto, l. c. art. Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers.]
4. *Ignatius* (θεοφόρος), bishop of Antioch, concerning whose life comp. Euseb. iii. 36. On his journey to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom under Trajan (116), he is said to have written seven epistles to different churches and to Polycarp, which are extant in two recensions, the one longer, the other shorter. On their genuineness, and the relation in which they stand to each other, comp. *J. Pearson,* Vindiciæ epp. S. Ign. Cant. 1672. *J. E. Ch. Schmidt,* die doppelte Recension der Briefe des Ign. (Henke's Magazin.

iii. p. 91, ss.) *K. Meier*, die doppelte Recension der Brief des Ignat. (Stud. und Kritiken, 1836, part 2.) On the other side: *Rothe*, die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche, Witt. 1837. *Arndt*, in Studien und Kritiken, 1839, p. 136. *Baur*, Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1838, part 3, p. 148. *Huther*, Betrachtung der wichtigsten Bedenken gegen die Aechtheit der Ignatianischen Briefe, in *Illgen's* Zeitschrift für historische Theolog. 1841–4. [*Lardner*, ii. 73–76. *Ryland, J. E.*, in Kitto, l. c. art. Epistles of the Apost. Fathers, where the literature is given. On the whole subject, see *especially* Mr. Cureton's *Corpus Ignationum.*] Comp. § 23.

5. *Polycarp*, bishop of Smyrna, according to tradition a disciple of the Apostle John, suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius (169.) Comp. Euseb. iv. 15. One of his epistles to the Philippians is yet extant, but only a part of it in the original Greek. Comp. *Wocher*, die Briefe der apost. Väter Clemens und Polycarp, mit Einleitung und Commentarien, Tübingen, 1830. [*Lardner*, ii. p. 94–109. *Ryland, J. E.*, in Kitto, l. c.]
6. *Papias* (σφόδρα σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν, Euseb. iii. 39), bishop of Hierapolis in the first half of the second century, of whose treatise λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις we have only fragments in Euseb. l. c. and Irenæus (v. 53.) As a millennarian he is of some importance for eschatology. *Complete editions of the writings of the Apostolical Fathers:* * Patrum, qui temporibus Apostolorum floruerunt, Opp. ed. *Cotelerius*, Par. 1672. rep. *Clericus*, Amst. 1698. 1724. 2. T. f. Patrum app. opp. genuina, ed. *B. Russel*, Lond. 1746. ii. 8. S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi, patrum apostolicorum quæ supersunt, accedunt S. Ignatii et S. Polycarpi martyria, ed. *Guil. Jacobson*, Oxon. 1838. *J. L. Frey*, Epistolæ sanctorum Patrum apostolicorum Clementis, Ignatii et Polycarpi atque duorum posteriorum martyria, Bas. 1742. 8. Patrum Apostolorum Opera, textum ex editt. præstantt. repetitum recognovit, brevi annotat. instruxit et in usum prælect academicar. edid †**C. J. Hefele*, Tub. 1839. Comp. *Ittig*, Bibl. Patr. apost. Lips. 1690. 8. [*Wake*, Archbishop, the genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, transl. Lond. 1737.]

As to the extent to which we can speak of a *theology* of the Apostolical Fathers s. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. p. 81, note. It is certain that some of them, e. g. Hermas, entertained notions which were afterwards rejected as heterodox. The earlier divines, and those of the Roman-Catholic church in particular, endeavoured to evade this difficulty by calling those doctrines *Archäisms,* in distinction from *heresies.*[a]

(2) *Justin Martyr* (born about the year 89, died 176,) of Sychem (Flavia Neapolis) in Samaria, a philosopher by vocation, who even after he had become a Christian, retained the τρίβων, made several missionary journeys, and suffered martyrdom, probably at the instigation of the philosopher Crescens. His *two apologies* are of special importance; the first designed for Antoninus Pius, the second probably for Marcus Aurelius. He is the first ecclesiastical writer whose writings manifest an acquaintance with the Grecian philosophy (in which he had formerly sought in vain for the full developement of truth, and for peace of mind.)[b] Though he is anxious to prove the excellencies of the religion of Christ, and even of the Old Testament dispensation in preference to the systems of philosophers, (by shewing that the latter derive their origin from the Mosaic system,) he also perceives something of a Divine nature in the better portion of the Gentile world. It must, however, be admitted that the tone prevailing in the apologies is much more liberal, than that which is found in the Cohortatio ad Græcos (παραινετικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας.) *Neander* (Kircheng. i. 3. p. 1120) is therefore inclined to consider the latter as spurious on account of the strong terms in which paganism is spoken of, and *Möhler* (Patrologie, p. 225) agrees with him. Yet there are various circumstances which may account for such a difference in style: the disposition of mind in which the author wrote his apologies would naturally be very different from that in which he composed a controversial treatise, especially if Neander's opinion be correct, that the latter was written at a later period of his life. These writings, as well as the doubtful λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας (oratio ad Græcos) and the Ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς Διόγνητον falsely ascribed to Justin M., and also the treatise περὶ μοναρχίας, consisting in great part of Grecian excerpts, set the relative position of Christianity and Paganism in a clear light. The

---

[a] It is certain that Pseudo-Dionysius, whom some writers number among the Apostolical Fathers, belongs to a later period. On the other side, *Möhler* and *Hefele* reckon the author of *the epistle to Diognetus* among the Apostolical Fathers, which was formerly ascribed to Justin. *Hefele*, PP. App. p. 125. *Möhler*, Patrologie, p. 164; Kleine Schriften, i. p. 19. On the other side: *Semisch*, Justin M. p. 186.

[b] On his philosophical tendency, see *Schleiermacher*, l. c. p. 155.

Dialogus cum Tryphone Judæo has reference to Judaism, which it opposes on its own grounds; its genuineness was doubted by *Wetstein* and *Semler*, but without sufficient reason, comp. *Neander*, Kircheng. i. 3. p. 1125, ss. The principal edition is that published by the Benedictines under the care of **Prud. Maran.* Paris, 1742, which includes also the writings of the following three authors, along with the (insignificant) satire of Hermias. [Comp. Justin Martyr, his life, writings, and doctrines, by *Carl Semisch.* Transl. by *J. E. Ryland.* Edin. 1844. *Neander*, hist. of the ch. transl. ii. p. 336—349. *Lardner*, ii. p. 126—128, 140, 141.] *Otto*, de Justini Martyris scriptio et doctrina commentatio, Jen. 1841. *Schwegler*, nachapostolisches Zeitalter, p. 216, ss.

(3) *Tatian*, the Syrian, a disciple of Justin M., became afterwards the leader of those Gnostics who are called the Encratites. In his work entitled: λόγος πρὸς Ἕλληνας (Ed. *Worth*, Oxon. 1700) he defends the "*philosophy of the barbarians*" against the Greeks. Comp. *Daniel, H. A.*, Tatianus der Apologet, ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte. Halle, 1837. 8. [*Neander*, l. c. ii. p. 349, 350. *Lardner*, ii. p. 147—150.]

(4) Little is known of the personal history of *Athenagoras;* comp. however *Clarisse*, de Athenagoræ vita, scriptis, doctrina, Lugd. 1819, 4, and *Möhler*, l. c. p. 267. His works are: Legatio pro Christianis (πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν) and the treatise de resurrectione mortuorum. [*Lardner*, ii. p. 193—200. *Neander*, l. c. p. 350—351.]

(5) *Theophilus*, bishop of Antioch, (170—180.) The work which he wrote against *Autolycus:* περὶ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστεως, manifests a less liberal spirit, but also displays both genius and power as a controversialist. *Rössler*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, i. p. 218, numbers it among the most worthless works of antiquity, and *Hase* calls it a narrow-minded controversial writing, while *Möhler* praises its excellencies. There is a German translation of it with notes by *Thienemann*. Leipz. 183.

(6) Ecclesiastical writers vary in their opinions concerning the period in which *Minucius Felix* lived. *Van Hoven*, *Rössler*, *Russwurm*, and *Heinrich Meier*, (Commentatio de Minucio Felice, Tur. 1824,) suppose him to have been contemporary with the Antonines. *Tzschirner*, (Geschichte der Apologetik, i. p. 257—282,) thinks that he lived at a later time (about 224—230); this seems to be the more correct opinion. Comp. Hieron. Cat. Script. c. 53. 58. Lactant. Inst. v. 1. A compa-

rison of the treatise of Minucius entitled Octavius with the apology of Tertullian, and with the work of Cyprian de idolorum vanitate, favours the view that he wrote *after* the former, but *before* the latter. The work of Cyprian appears in some parts as a copy of the writing of Minucius; that of Tertullian bears the marks of an original. The dialogue between Cæcilius and Octavius is of importance in the history of Apologetics, as it touches upon all the objections which we find separately treated of by the other apologists, and adds some new ones. With regard to the doctrinal opinions of Minucius, and the spirit which pervades his book, we may remark that he is distinguished by a more liberal, hellenistic manner of thinking; but it is to be regretted that his views are less positive, less decidedly Christian than is desirable. We seek almost in vain in his book for more direct references to the Messiah. *Editions:* Edit. princeps by *Balduin*, 1560. Since that time: editions by *Elmenhorst* (1612.) *Cellarius* (1699.) *Davisius* (1707.) *Ernesti* (1773.) *Russwurm* (with introduct. and notes, 1824.) *Lübkert* (with translation and commentary, Leipz. 1836.) [*Lardner*, ii. p. 386–389. *Bennett*, l. c. p. 39-42.]

(7) *Irenæus*, a disciple of Polycarp, bishop of Lyons, about the year 177, died in the year 202, "*a clear-headed, considerate, philosophical theologian.*" (*Hase, Guerike.*) Except a few letters and fragments, his principal work alone is extant, viz five books against the Gnostics: Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως; the first book only has come down in the original language, the greatest part of the remaining four books is now known only in an old Latin translation. The best editions are those of *Grabe*, Oxon. 1702, and **Massuet*, Paris, 1710. Venet. 1734. 47. Comp. Euseb. v. 4. 20–26. *Möhler*, Patrologie, p. 330. [*Neander*, l. c. p. 356—359. *Davidson*, l. c. p. 83, ss. *Lardner*, ii. p. 165—193. *Burton*, v. p. 185, and passim. *Bennett*, l. c. 28—33.] *Duncker*, des heil. Irenæus Christologie, im Zusammenhange mit dessen theologischen und anthropologischen Grundlehren, Gött. 1843. Comp. also what *Dorner* says concerning him, ii. 1. p. 465.

(8) *Tertullian* (Quintus Septimius Florens) was born in Carthage about the year 160, and died 220; in his earlier life he was a lawyer and rhetorician, and became afterwards the most conspicuous representative of the antispeculative, positive tendency. Comp. *Neander*, Antignosticus, Geist des Tertullian und Einleitung in dessen Schriften, Berlin, 1825, especially the

striking characteristic which he there gives of Tert. *Münter*, Primordia ecclesiæ Africanæ, Havn. 1829, 4. "*A gloomy, ardent character, by whose exertions Christianity obtained from Punic Latin a literature in which ingenious rhetoric, a wild imagination, a gross, sensuous perception of the ideal, profound sentiments, and a lawyer's reasoning struggle with each other.*" (*Hase.*) Gfrörer calls him the Tacitus of early Christianity. "*Notwithstanding his hatred against philosophy, Tertullian is certainly not the least of Christian thinkers.*" *Schwegler*, Montanismus, p. 218. That sentence of his: "ratio autem divina in medulla est, non in superficie" (de resurrect. c. 3.), may guide us in our endeavours to ascertain the right meaning of many strange assertions, and to account for his remarkably concise style (quot pæne verba, tot sententiæ, Vinc. Lir. in comm. 1.) Of his numerous writings the following are the most important for the history of doctrines: Apologeticus—ad nationes—(advers. Judæos)—*advers. Marcionem—*advers. Hermogenem—*advers. Praxeam—*advers. Valentinianos—*Scorpiace advers. Gnosticos—(de præscriptionibus advers. Hæreticos)—de testimonio animæ—*de anima—*de carne Christi—*de resurrectione carnis—(de pœnitentia)—(de baptismo)—de oratione, etc.; his moral writings also contain many references to doctrinal points, *e. g.* the treatises de corona militis—de virginibus velandis—de cultu feminarum, etc. Editions of his complete works were published by **Rigaltius*, Paris, 1635, fol.; by *Semler* and *Schütz*, Hall. 1770. 6 vols. (with a useful index latinitatis;) and lastly, by *Leopold*, Lips. 1841. [*Neander*, l. c. ii. p. 362–366; p. 293–296. *Burton*, l. c. v. p. 233, a. passim. *Lardner*, ii. p. 267–272, a. passim. *Davidson*, l. c. p. 90, ss.] Later theologians did not venture to number Tert. among the orthodox writers, on account of his Montanistic views. In the opinion of Jerome, (adv. Helvid. 17,) he is not a *homo ecclesiæ;* comp. also Apol. contra Ruffin. iii. 27.

(9) *Cyprian* (Thascius Cæcilius) was for a time public teacher of rhetoric in Carthage; his conversion to Christianity took place in the year 245; he became bishop of Carthage in the year 248, and suffered martyrdom 258. He possessed more of a practical than doctrinal tendency, and is therefore of greater importance in the history of ecclesiastical polity than of doc-

---

* The works marked with * were written after his conversion to Montanism, those included in ( ) show that Montanism had exerted some influence upon him; comp. *Nösselt*, de vera ætate Tertulliani scriptorum (opusc. Fasc. iii. 1–198.)

trines, to which he has contributed but little. The great task of his life seems to have been not so much theoretically to develope the doctrine of the *church* and the *sacraments*, as practically to demonstrate it by his life, and to uphold it in the tempests of the times. In his doctrinal opinions he rested on the basis laid by Tertullian, but adhered also to Minucius Felix, as in his work de idolorum vanitate. From the foregoing considerations it will appear, that along with his numerous letters the work entitled: de unitate ecclesiæ is deserving of special attention. In addition to these we may mention: libri iii. testimoniorum—de bono patientiæ—de oratione dominica, etc. Comp. *Rettberg*, Cyprian nach seinem Leben und Wirken, Göttingen 1834. *Huther* (*Ed.*), Cyprians Lehre von der Kirche, Hamburg, 1839. *Editions: Rigaltius*, Paris, 1648, fol. **Fell*, Oxon. 1682, and the Benedictine edition by *Steph. Baluz* and *Prud. Maran*, Paris, 1729.—*Novatian*, the contemporary and opponent of Cyprian, (ὁ τῆς ἐκκλεσιαστικῆς ἐπιστήμης ὑπερασπιστής,) Euseb. vi. 43,) must also be considered as belonging to this period, if the treatise: de trinitate (de regula veritatis s. fidei) which goes under his name, proceeded from him. It is by no means correct, as Jerome would make us believe, that this treatise contains nothing but extracts from Tertullian. "*This author was at all events more than a mere imitator of the peculiar tendency of another; on the contrary, he shows originality; he does not possess the power and depth of Tertullian, but more spirituality.*" *Neander*, i. 3, p. 1165. *Editions: Whiston*, in his sermons and essays upon several subjects, Lond. 1709, p. 327. *Welchman*, Oxon. 1724, 8. *Jackson*, Lond. 1728. [*Neander*, l. c. ii. p. 367, 368. *Lardner*, iii. p. 3–20. *Bennett*, l. c. 47–49.]

(10) *Clement* (*Tit. Flav.*), surnamed Alexandrinus in distinction from Clement of Rome, a disciple of Pantænus at Alexandria, and his successor in his office died between 212 and 220. (Comp. Euseb. v. 11. vi. 6. 13. 14. Hieron. de vir. ill. c. 38.) Of his works the following three form a whole: 1. Λόγος προτρεπτικὸς πρὸς Ἕλληνας. 2. Παιδαγωγὸς in three books, and 3. Stromata (τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀληθῆ φιλοσοφίαν γνωστικῶν ὑπομνημάτων στρωματεῖς)—so called from the variety of its contents—in 8 books, the eighth of which forms a special homily, under the title: τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος, quis dives salvetur. The ὑποτυπώσεις in 8 books, an exegetical work, are lost. Concerning his life and writings, comp. *Hofstede de Groot*, de Clemente Alex.

Gröning. 1826. *Von Cölln*, in Ersch and Gruber's Encyclopædia, xviii. p. 4, ss. *Daehne*, de γνώσει Clem. et de vestigiis neoplatonicæ plilos. in ea obviis. Leipz. 1831. *Eylert*, Clemens als Philosoph und Dichter, Leipz. 1832. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 502. *Möhler*, Patrologie, p. 430. [*Lardner*, Works, ii. 220–224. *Neander*, l. c. ii. p. 373–376. *Bennett*, l. c. p. 33–36.] *Editions* by *Sylburg*, Heidelberg, 1592. **Potter*, Oxon. 1715, fol. Ven. 1757. *R. Klotz*, Lipz. 1831, 3 vols. 8.

(11) *Origen*, surnamed ἀδαμάντινος, χαλκέντερος, was born at Alexandria, about the year 185, a disciple of Clement, and died at Tyre in the year 254. He is undoubtedly the most eminent writer of the whole period, and the best representative of the spiritualizing tendency. He is, however, not wholly free from great faults into which he was led by his talents. "*According to all appearance he would have avoided most of the faults which disfigure his writings, if his reason, humour and imagination had been equally strong. His reason frequently overcomes his imagination,—but his imagination obtains more victories over his reason.*" *Mosheim* (Translat. of the treatise against Celsus, p. 60.) Accounts of his life are given in Euseb. vi. 1–6. 8. 14–21. 23–28. 30–33. 36–39. vii. 1. Hieron. de viris illustr. c. 54. Gregory Thaumaturg. in Panegyrico. *Huetius* in the Origeniana. *Tillemont*, Mémoires, art. Origène, p. 356–76. *Schröckh*, iv. p. 29. [*Neander*, l. c. ii. p. 376–91. *Lardner*, ii. p. 469–486 and passim. *Vaughan, R. A.*, Origen, his life, writings, and opinions. In the Britt. Quarterly Review, No. iv. 1845, p. 491–527.] On his doctrines and writings, comp. *Schnitzer*, Origenes, über die Grundlehren der Glaubenswissenschaft, Stuttg. 1835. **Thomasius (Gottf.)*, Origenes, ein Beitrag zur Dogmengeschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts, Nürnberg, 1837. *Redepenning*, Origenes, eine Darstellung seines Lebens und seiner Lehre, I. Bonn, 1841, II. 1846. The labours of Origen embraced a wide sphere. We merely notice his exertions for biblical criticism (Hexapla), and exegesis (σημειώσεις, τόμοι, ὁμιλίαι), as well as for homiletics which appear in his writings in their simplest forms, and name only that which is of dogmatic importance, viz. his two principal works: περὶ ἀρχῶν (de principiis libri iv.) edit. by *Redepenning*, Lips. 1836, and *Schnitzer's* translation before mentioned; and κατὰ Κέλσου (contra Celsum) lib. viii. (translated, with notes by *Mosheim*, Hamb. 1745), and the minor treatises: de oratione, de exhortatione Martyrii, etc. *Complete editions* of his works were published by

**Car. de la Rue*, Paris, 1733, ss. 4 vols. fol.. and by *Lommatzsch*, Berl. 1831, ss.—The doctrinal systems of Clement and Origen together form what is called the theology of the *Alexandrian* school. The distinguishing characteristics of this theology, in a formal point of view, are a leaning to speculation and allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures; in a material aspect they consist of an attempt to spiritualize the ideas, and idealize the doctrines, and they thus form a striking contrast with the peculiarities of Tertullian in particular. Comp. *Guerike*, de schola quæ Alexandriæ floruit Catechetica. Halæ, 1824, 2 vols. [*Neander*, l. c. ii. p. 195–234. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 488–543. Comp. also *Davidson*, l. c. p. 96, ss. 106, ss.]

§ 27.

THE GENERAL DOGMATIC CHARACTER OF THIS PERIOD.

It was the characteristic feature of the apologetical period, that the whole system of Christianity as a religious-moral fact was considered, and defended, rather than particular doctrines. Still certain doctrines become more prominent, while others receive less attention. Investigations of a theological and christological nature are certainly more numerous than those of an anthropological character, and the Pauline doctrine is supplanted in some degree by that of John.(1) On this account the doctrine of human liberty is made more conspicuous in this period than later writers approved.(2) Next to theology and christology, eschatology engaged most the attention of Christians at that time, and was more fully developed in the struggle with millennarianism on the one side, and the scepticism of Grecian philosophers on the other.

(1) Comp. § 18, note 4.

(2) Origen expressly mentions, that the doctrine concerning the freedom of the will forms a part of the prædicatio ecclesiastica, de princ. proœm. § 4, ss.

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE FIRST PERIOD.

FIRST SECTION.

APOLOGETICO-DOGMATIC PROLEGOMENA.

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.—REVELATION AND SOURCES OF REVELATION.—SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

§ 28.

TRUTH AND DIVINITY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION IN GENERAL.

**Tzschirner*, Geschichte der Apologetik, vol. i. Leipz. 1808. By the same: der Fall des Heidenthums, vol. i. Leipz. 1829. *Clausen, H. N.*, Apologetæ ecclesiæ Christianæ ante-Theodosiani, Havn. 1817. 8. *G. H. van Senden*, Geschichte der Apologetik von den frühesten Zeiten bis auf unsere Tage. Stuttg. II. 8.

The principal task of this period was to prove the Divine origin of Christianity as the true religion made known by revelation,(1) and to set forth the internal, as well as external relation which it bore both to Gentiles and to Jews. This was accomplished in different ways, according to the different ideas which obtained regarding the nature of the new religion. The Ebionites considered the principal object of Christianity to be the realization of the Jewish notions concerning the Messiah,(2) the Gnostics regarded it as consisting in the separation of Christianity from its former connection with the Old Test.(3) Between these two extremes the Catholic church endeavoured, on the one hand, to preserve this connection with the old dispensation; on the other, to point men to the new dispensation, and to show the superiority of the latter to the former.

(1) Here we must guard against seeking for a distinction between natural and revealed religion, or even for a precise definition of the term "religion." Such definitions of the schoolmen did not make their appearance until later, when theory and practice, science and life being separated, learned men commenced to speculate on the objects of science, and to reduce experimental truths to general ideas. With the first Christians, Christianity and religion were identical; and thus again in modern times, the principal object of apologetics has become to prove that Christianity is *the* religion, *i. e.* the only one which can satisfy man, (comp. *Lechler*, über den Begriff der Apologetik, in the Studien und Kritiken 1839, part 3.) This view corresponds to the saying of *Minucius Felix*, Oct. c. 38, towards the end: Gloriamur non consequutos, quod illi (Philosophi) summa intentione quæsiverunt nec invenire potuerunt. *Justin M.* also shows that revealed truth, as such, does not stand in need of any proof, dial. c. Tryph. c. 7. p. 109: Οὐ γὰρ μετὰ ἀποδείξεως πεποίηνταί ποτε (οἱ προφῆται) τοὺς λόγους, ἅτε ἀνωτέρω πάσης ἀποδείξεως ὄντες ἀξιόπιστοι μάρτυρες τῆς ἀληθείας. Fragm. de Resurr. ab init.: Ὁ μὲν τὴς ἀληθείας λόγος ἐστὶν ἐλεύθερος καὶ αὐτεξούσιος, ὑπὸ μηδεμίαν βάσανον ἐλέγχου θέλων πίπτειν, μηδὲ τὴν παρὰ τοῖς ἀκούουσι δι' ἀποδείξεως ἐξέτασιν ὑπομένειν. Τὸ γὰρ εὐγενὲς αὐτοῦ καὶ πεποιθὸς αὐτῷ τῷ πέμψαντι πιστεύεσθαι θέλει...πᾶσα γὰρ ἀπόδειξις ἰσχυροτέρα καὶ πιστοτέρα τοῦ ἀποδρεικνυμένου τυγχανει· εἴ γε τὸ πρότερον ἀπιστούμενον πρινὴ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν ἐλθεῖν, ταύτης κομισθείσης ἔτυχε πίστεως, καὶ τοιοῦτον ἐφάνη, ὁποῖον ἐλέγετο. Τῆς δὲ ἀληθείας ἰσχυρότερον οὐδὲν, οὐδὲ πιστότερον· ὥστε ὁ περὶ ταύτης ἀπόδειξιν αἰτῶν ὅμοιός ἐστι τῷ τὰ φαινόμενα αἰσθήσεσι λόγοις θέλοντι ἀποδείκνυσθαι, διότι φαίνεται. Τῶν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ λόγου λαμβανομένων κριτήριόν ἐστιν ἡ αἴσθησις· αὐτῆς δὲ κριτήριον οὐκ ἔστι πλὴν αὐτῆς. Nor do we find any definitions of the nature and idea of *revelation* (contrasted with the truths which come to us by nature and reason), of the abstract possibility and necessity of revelation, etc., because such contrasts did not then exist. Christianity (in connection with the Old Test.) was considered as the true revelation; even the best ideas of earlier philosophers compared with it were only like the

twilight which precedes the brightness of the rising sun. Comp. *Justin M* Dial. c. Tr. ab initio.—*Tert.* apolog. c. 18, (de testim. animæ, c. 2,) speaks very decidedly in favour of the positive character of the Christian religion (*fiunt*, non *nascuntur* Christiani), though he also calls the human soul naturaliter christiana (Apol. c. 17), and ascribes to it the innate power of appropriating to itself, without any supernatural aid, all that may be known of the Divine Being by the works of nature, de testim. an. 5. *Clement of Alexandria* also compares the attempt of philosophers to comprehend the Divine without a higher revelation, to the attempt of a man to run without feet (Cohort. p. 64); and further remarks, that without the light of revelation we should resemble hens which are fattened in a dark cage in order to die (ibid. p. 87.) We become the children of God only by the religion of Christ (p. 88, 89,) comp. Pæd. i. 2, p. 100, i. 12, p. 156, and in numerous other places. Clement indeed admits that wise men before Christ had approached the truth to a certain extent, but while they sought God by their own wisdom, others (the Christians) find him (better) through the medium of the Logos, comp. Pæd. iii. 8, p. 279. Strom. i. 1, p. 319, ibid. i. 6, p. 336. The Clementine Homilies, however, depart from this idea of a positive revelation (17. 8. and 18. 6), and represent the *internal* revelation of the heart as the true revelation, the *external* as a manifestation of the Divine ὀργή. Comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, ii. p. 783; on the other side, *Schliemann*, p. 183, ss. 353, ss.

(2) According to the Clementine Homilies there is no essential difference between the doctrine of Jesus and the doctrine of Moses. Comp. *Credner*, l. c. part 2, p. 254. *Schliemann*, p. 215, ss.

(3) As most of the Gnostics looked upon the demiurgus either as a being that stood in a hostile relation to God, or as a being of inferior rank, and limited powers; as they, moreover, considered the entire economy of the Old Test. as a defective, and even perverse institution, we can easily conceive that in their view the blessings which have come to us as the effects of the religion of Christ, consist only in our deliverance from the bonds of the demiurgus. (Comp. the §§ on God, the fall, and redemption.)

§ 29.

MODE OF ARGUMENT.

From what has been said before, it appears that the Christian apologists did not confine themselves to the New Test., but that they also (in opposition to the Gentiles) defended the history, laws, doctrines, and prophecies of the Old Test. against the attacks of all who were not Jews.(1) After having thus laid a foundation, they proceeded to prove the superiority of Christianity to both the Jewish and Pagan systems, by showing how all the prophecies and types of the O. Test. had been fulfilled in Christ.(2) It must, however, be admitted, that they not unfrequently indulged in arbitrary and unnatural interpretations, and that some of their expositions of the types and figures of the law are in a high degree fanciful.(3) But as the apologists found in the O. Test. a point of connection with Judaism, so they found in the Grecian philosophy a point of connection with Paganism; with this difference only, that whatever is Divine in the latter, is for the greatest part derived from the O. Test.,(4) corrupted by the artifices of demons,(5) and appears, at all events, very imperfect in comparison with Christianity, however great the analogy may be.(6) Even those writers who, like Tertullian, discarded the philosophical developement of the understanding, because they perceived in it nothing but an ungodly perversity,(7) were compelled to admit a profound psychological connection between human nature and the Christian religion (the testimony of the soul,)(8) and to derive with others a principal argument for the Divine origin of Christianity from its moral effects.(9) Thus the external argument which is founded upon the miracles of the N. Test.,(10) was adduced only as a kind of auxiliary proof, and its complete validity was no longer acknowledged.(11) As auxiliary proofs we may further consider the argument derived from the Sibylline oracles,(12) the miraculous spread of Christianity in the midst of persecutions,(13) and the accomplishment of the prophecy relative to the destruction of Jerusalem.(14) The last two were, like the moral argument, taken from what happened at that time.

(1) This argument was founded especially upon the high antiquity of the sacred books, and the miraculous care of God for their preservation; *Josephus* argued in a similar manner against *Apion*, i. 8.

(2) Comp. *Justin M.* Apol. i. c. 32—35. dial. cum Tryphone, § 7. 8. 11. *Athenag.* leg. c. 9. *Orig.* contra Cels. i. 2. Comment. in Joh. T. ii. 28. Opp. iv. p. 87.

(3) Ep. Barn. c. 9. The circumcision of the 318 persons by Abraham (Gen. xvii.) is represented as a mystery which was made known to him. The number three hundred and eighteen is composed of three hundred, and eight, and ten. The numeral letters of ten and eight are I and H (η), which are the initials of the name Ἰησοῦς. The numeral letter of three hundred is T, which is the symbol of the cross. And *Clement of Rome*, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, which is generally sober enough, says that the scarlet line which Rahab was admonished by the spies to hang out of her house, was a type of the blood of Christ, c. 12. Likewise *Justin M.* dialog. cum Tryph. § 111. According to him the two wives of Jacob, Lea and Rachel, are types of the Jewish and Christian dispensations, the two goats on the day of atonement types of the two advents of Christ, the twelve bells upon the robe of the high-priest types of the twelve apostles, etc. Justin carries this mode of interpretation to an extreme length, especially with regard to the cross, which he sees everywhere, not only in the O. T. (in the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the rod of Aaron, etc.) but also in nature, in the horn of the unicorn, in the human countenance, in the posture of a man engaged in prayer, in the vessel with its sails, in the plough, in the hammer. Comp. Apol. i. c. 55, dial. cum Tryph. § 97. and elsewhere. Comp. *Minuc. Felix*, c. 29; but he does not deduce any further conclusions from such figurative

language. *Irenæus* sees in the three spies of Jericho the three persons in the Godhead, advers. Hæret. iv. 20. It would be easy to multiply these examples ad infinitum, (comp § 33, note 3.)

(4) *Justin M.* Apol. i. c. 59. Cohort. ad Græc. c. 14. *Theophil.* ad Autol. iii. 16, 17, 20, 23. *Tatian* contra Græc. ab init. and c. 25. *Tertullian*, Apol. c. 19 : Omnes itaque substantias, omnesque materias, origines, ordines, venas veterani cujusque stili vestri, gentes etiam plerasque et urbes insignes, canas memoriarum, ipsas denique effigies litterarum indices custodesque rerum, et puto adhuc minus dicimus, ipsos inquam deos vestros, ipsa templa et oracula et sacra, unius interim prophetæ scrinium vincit, in quo videtur thesaurus collocatus totius Judaici sacramenti, et inde etiam nostri. *Clem. Alexand.* Pæd. ii. c. 1, p. 176, c. 10, p. 224, iii. c. 11, p. 286. Stromata, i. p. 355, vi. p. 752, and many other passages. He therefore calls Plato ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφος, Strom. i. 1. Comp. *Baur*, Gnosis p. 256. *Orig.* contra Cels. iv. ab init. *Tzschirner*, Geschichte der Apologetik, p 101, 102.

(5) *Justin M.* Apol. i. c. 54. Thus the demons are said to have been present when Jacob blessed his sons. But as the heathen philosophers could not interpret the passage Gen. xlix. 11 : Binding his foal unto the vine, in its true Messianic sense, they referred it to Bacchus, the inventor of the vine, and changed the foal into Pegasus (because they did not know whether the animal in question was a horse or an ass.) In a similar manner a misinterpretation of the prophecy relative to the conception of the virgin (Is. vii. 14,) gave rise to the fable of Perseus, etc., (comp. § 49.)

(6) *Justin M.* calls in a certain sense Christians all those who live according to the laws of the Logos (reason,) Apology, i. c. 46. The Platonic Philosophy is in his opinion not absolutely different (ἀλλοτρία) from Christianity. But before the coming of Christ there existed in the world only the seeds (λόγος σπερματικός) of what was manifested afterwards in Christ as absolute truth, comp. Apol. ii. c. 13. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. i. c. 20, p. 376 : Χωρίζεται δὲ ἡ ἑλληνικὴ ἀλήθεια τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς, εἰ καὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μετείληφεν ὀνόματος, καὶ μεγέθει γνώσεως καὶ ἀποδείξει κυριωτέρᾳ, καὶ θείᾳ δυνάμει καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίοις. (He speaks, however, of philosophy as such, and not of the Stoic, Platonic, Epicuræan, Aristotelian, or any other philosophy, Strom. i. 7, p. 338,) comp. *Baur*, p. 520, ss. Clement

involves himself in contradictions in judging of paganism more favourably at one time and less so at another; comp. Baur, p. 532. *Minucius Felix,* c. 16, in opposition to the scholastic wisdom of the ancient philosophers, recommends the philosophy of good sense which is accessible to all (ingenium, quod non studio paratur, sed cum ipsa mentis formatione generatur,) and despises mere reliance on authorities; nevertheless he himself appeals to the doctrines of philosophers, and their partial agreement with Christianity, c. 19, c. 21, c. 34. Such language forms a remarkable contrast with the attack he makes upon Socrates (scurra Atticus) c. 38, to whom others would assign the highest rank among the ancient philosophers.

(7) *Tert.* de præscr. 7, 8: Hæ sunt doctrinæ hominum et dæmoniorum, prurientibus auribus natæ de ingenio sapientiæ secularis, quam Dominus stultitiam vocans, stulta mundi in confusionem etiam philosophorum ipsius elegit. Ea est enim materia sapientiæ secularis, temeraria interpres divinæ naturæ et dispositionis. Ipsæ denique hæreses a philosophia subornantur . . . . Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosoloymis! quid Academiæ et Ecclesiæ? quid hæreticis et Christianis? Nostra institutio de porticu Salomonis est, qui et ipse tradiderat Dominum in simplicitate cordis esse quærendum. Viderint, qui Stoicum et Platonicum et dialectum christianismum protulerunt. Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium. Cum credimus, nihil desideramus ultra credere. Tertullian calls the philosophers patriarchæ hæreticorum (de anima 3; adv. Hermog. 8,) and Plato omnium hæreticorum condimentarius (de anima, 23.)

(8) *Tert.* de test. anim. 1: Novum testimonium advoco, immo omni litteratura notius, omni doctrina agitatius, omni editione vulgatius, toto homine majus, *i. e.,* totum quod est hominis. Consiste in medio, anima . . . Sed non eam te advoco, quæ scholis formata, bibliothecis exercitata, academicis et porticibus Atticis parta, sapientiam ructas. Te simplicem et rudem et impolitam et idioticam compello, qualem te habent qui te solam habent, illam ipsam de compito, de trivio, de textrino totam. Imperitia tua mihi opus est, quoniam aliquantulæ peritiæ nemo credit. Ea expostulo, quæ tecum hominis infers, quæ aut ex temet ipsa, aut ex quocunque auctore tuo sentire didicisti; Ibid: Non es, quod sciam Christiana: fieri enim, non nasci soles Christiana. Tamen nunc a te testimonium flagitant Christiani,

ab extranea adversus tuos, ut vel tibi erubescant, quod vos ob ea oderint et irrideant, quæ te nunc consciam detineant. Non placemus Deum prædicantes hoc nomine unico unicum, a quo omnia et sub quo universa. Dic testimonium, si ita scis. Nam te quoque palam et tota libertate, quia non licet nobis, domi ac foris audimus ita pronuntiare: Quod Deus dederit, et si Deus voluerit, etc. Comp. Apol. c. 17; de virgin. veland. c. 5. (tacita conscientia naturæ). *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 86—89. *Schwegler*, Montanismus, p. 28, ss.

(9) *Justin, M.* Apology, i. c. 14: Οἱ πάλαι μὲν πορνείαις χαίροντες, νῦν δὲ σωφροσύνην μόνην ἀσπαζόμενοι· οἱ δὲ καὶ μαγικαῖς τέχναις χρώμενοι, ἀγαθῷ καὶ ἀγεννήτῳ θεῷ ἑαυτοὺς ἀνατεθεικότες· χρημάτων δε καὶ κτημάτων οἱ πόρους παντὸς μᾶλλον στέργοντες, νῦν καὶ ἃ ἔχομεν εἰς κοινὸν φέροντες, καὶ παντὶ δεομένῳ κοινωνοῦντες· οἱ μισάλληλοι δὲ καὶ ἀλληλοφόνοι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς οὐχ ὁμοφύλους διὰ τὰ ἔθη ἑστίας κοινὰς μὴ ποιούμενοι, νῦν μετά τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁμοδίαιτοι γινόμενοι, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐχόμενοι καὶ τοὺς ἀδίκως μισοῦντας πείθειν πειρώμενοι, ὅπως οἱ κατὰ τὰς τοῦ Χριστοῦ καλὰς ὑποθημοσύνας βιώσαντες εὐέλπιδες ὦσι, σὺν ἡμῖν τῶν αὐτῶν παρὰ τοῦ πάντων δεσπόζοντος Θεοῦ τυχεῖν. Dial. cum Tryph. § 8. 30. Orat. ad Græcos, 5. Epist. ad Diognetum, 5. *Athenag.* leg. c. 11. *Tert.* Apol. ab init. *Minucius Felix*, c. 31, 37, 38. *Orig.* contra Cels. i. c. 26. Opp. i. p. 345. They were in practice compelled to have recourse to this argument through the charges brought forward by the Gentiles, which they endeavoured to refute.

(10) Not only were those miracles adduced which are mentioned in Scripture, but also those which still took place. (*Just. M.* Dialog. c. Tryph. c. 39, 82, 88. *Iren.* ii. 31, 32. *Orig.* contra Cels. iii. 24. Opp. i. p. 461. At the same time the Christians did not directly deny the existence of miracles in the heathen world, but ascribed them to the influence of demons (ibid. and *Minucius Fel.* Oct. c. 26); the Gentiles, on the other hand, attributed the Christian miracles to magic. Comp. *Tatian* contra Græcos, c. 18. *Orig.* contra Cels. i. 38, 67, 68. iii. 24–33. We find, however, that Minucius Felix denies the reality of miracles and myths in the pagan world, on the ground of the physical impossibility of such supernatural events; but it may be observed, that that ground might, with equal propriety, have been taken by the opponents of Christianity. Octav. c. 20: Quæ si essent facta, fierent; quia fieri non possunt, ideo nec facta sunt; and c. 23: Cur enim si nati sunt, non hodieque nascuntur?

(11) Though *Origen*, in speaking of the evidence derived from

miracles, as compared with the evidence derived from prophecy, calls the former the evidence of power, and the latter the evidence of the spirit (contra Cels. i. 2), yet he gives the preference to the evidence of the spirit. He was well aware that a miracle produces a strong impression upon the person we wish to convince, only when it is performed in his presence, but that it loses all its force as evidence with those whose mind is prejudiced against the veracity of the narrative, and who reject miracles as myths, comp. Comment. in Joh. Opp. iv. p. 87. Nor do the Clementine Homilies admit miracles as evidences, while they lay greater stress upon prophecies. (*Credner*, l. c. part 3. p. 278, comp. with p. 245.) Origen spoke also of *spiritual* and *moral* miracles, of which the visible miracles were the symbols (he admitted, however, their importance, inasmuch as they are real facts); contra Cels. ii. p. 423: "I shall say that according to the promise of Jesus his disciples have performed greater miracles than himself; for to the present moment they who were blind in spirit, have their eyes opened, and they who were deaf to the voice of virtue, listen eagerly to the doctrine concerning God, and eternal life; many who were lame in the inner man, skip like the hart," etc. Comp. contra Cels. iii. 24; where he speaks of the healing of the sick, and of prophesying as an indifferent thing (μέσον), which considered in itself does not possess any moral value.

(12) *Theophilus* ad Autolycum, ii. 31, 36, 38. *Clem.* Cohort. p. 86. Stromata, vi. 5. 762. Celsus charged the Christians with having corrupted the Sibylline books. (Orat. contra Cels. vii. 32, 34.) *Editions* of the Sibyll. oracles were published by *Servatius Gallæus*, Amstel. 1689. 4. and by *Angelo Mai*, Mediolani, 1817, 8. On their origin and tendency, comp. *Thorlacius*, Libri Sibyllistarum veteris ecclesiæ, etc. Havniæ, 1815, 8, and *Bleek* in the Berliner theolog. Zeitschrift, i. 120, ss. 172, ss. [*Stuart*, Commentary on the Apocalypse, I. p. 87–107.] The case of the Ὑστάσπης, to whom Justin M. Apol. i. 20, and Clem. l. c. appeal, is similar to that of the Sibylline books. Comp. *Walch, Ch. F. W.*, de Hystaspide in vol. i. of the Commentat. Societ. Reg. Götting. But the oracles of the heathen (though a partial use was made of them), as well as their miracles, were attributed to demonaical agency; Minuc. Fel. c. 26, 27, Clement. Homil. iii. 9–13.

(13) *Origen* contra Cels. i. p. 321. ii. 361. de princip. iv. *Justin*

M. himself (and many others) had been converted by witnessing the firmness which many of the martyrs exhibited. Comp. his Apology, ii. p. 96, and Dialog. cum Tryph. § 121: *Καὶ οὐδένα οὐδέποτε ἰδεῖν ἔστιν ὑπομείναντα διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον πίστιν ἀποθανεῖν, διὰ δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ παντὸς γένους ἀνθρώπων καὶ ὑπομείναντας καὶ ὑπομένοντας πάντα πάσχειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ἀρνήσασθαι αὐτὸν ἰδεῖν ἔστι κ. τ. λ.*

(14) Origen contra Celsum, ii. 13. Opp. i. p. 400.

§ 30.

SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.

Orelli, J. C. Selecta patrum ecclesiæ capita ad *εἰσηγητικήν* sacram pertinentia, Turici 1820. Comp. his essay: Tradition und Scription, in *Schulthess* über Rationalism und Supranaturalism *Christmann, W. L.*, über Tradition und Schrift, Logos und Kabbala, Tübingen, 1825. *Schenkel, D.*, über das ursprüngliche Verhältniss der Kirche zum Kanon, Basel, 1838.

The original living source from whence the knowledge of all truth was derived, was the spirit of Christ himself who, according to his promise, guided the Apostles, and the first teachers of Christianity, into all truth. The Catholic church therefore considered herself from the first as the bearer of this spirit, and consequently maintained that the charge of the true tradition, and the developement of the doctrines which it teaches, were committed to her.(1) The task of the first church was to preserve oral traditions, to collect the written apostolical documents, and to determine the Canon. It was not until this Canon was nearly completed, and about to assume its present form, that the tradition of the church, as it existed both in its oral and its written forms, was distinctly separated from, and held along with the sacred Canon, like a distinct branch of the same original source.(2)

(1) The doctrine concerning the Scriptures and tradition can be fully understood only, when taken in connection with the dogma concerning the church (§ 71.)

(2) On this account it is not quite correct to represent Scripture and tradition as two sources which rise near each other. On the contrary, *both* flow from one *common* source, and run in different directions only after some time.—The same term κανών (regula scil. fidei) was first applied to either of them.—For its usage comp. *Suicer* (Thesaurus Ecclesiast. sub voce) and *Planck, H.*, nonnulla de significatu canonis in ecclesia antiqua ejusque serie recte constituenda, Gött. 1820. *Nitzsch*, System der christlichen Lehre, § 40, 41. [*Lardner*, Works, v. p. 257.] According to the Montanists there are various historical degrees or periods of revelation, viz. 1. *The law and the prophets;* the period of primitive revelation, which extends to the manifestation of Christ, and corresponds to the duritia cordis. 2. *The period of the Christian revelation*, represented by Christ and the Apostles, and corresponding to the infirmitas carnis. 3. *The period of the revelation of the paraclete*, extending to the end of time, and corresponding to the sanctitas spiritualis. Comp. Tertull. de monogam. 14. *Schwegler*, Montanismus, p. 37.

§ 31.

CANON OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES.

[*Cosin*, Scholastic History of the Canon, 4to. Lond. 1657. 1672. *Du Pin*, History of the Canon and Writers of the Books of the Old and New Test., 2 vols. fol. Lond. 1699—1700. *Schmid*, Historia Antiq. et Vindicatio Canonis V. et N. T. Lips. 1775. *Jones*, New and Full Method of settling the Canonic. Authority of the N. Test. 3 vols. *Alexander*, Canon of the O. and N. Test ascertained. Lond. 1828. **Lardner, N.*, Credibility of the Gospel History. (Works, i. to iv. and v. to p. 251.) *Alexander, W. L.*, on the Canon, in *Kitto*, Cycl. of Bibl. Liter. where the literature is given.] *J. Kirchhofer*, Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons bis auf Hieronymus, Zur. 1844. II.

Before the formation of the Canon of the N. Test. that of the O. Test.(1) which had been previously established, was held in high esteem in the Catholic church. The Gnostics, however, and the Marcionites in particular, rejected the O. Test.(2) A desire gradually arose in the Christian Church to possess the writings of the Apostles and evangelists in a collective form. These writings owed their origin to different causes. The apostolical epistles had been written as circumstances required, and were primarily intended to meet the exigencies of the times; the narratives of the so-called evangelists(3) had likewise been composed with a view to supply present wants, but also with some regard to posterity. These testimonies of primitive Christianity would serve as an authoritative standard of religion and morals, and form an effective barrier against the introduction of all that was either of a heterogeneous nature, or more recent date (apocryphal.) *The Canon of the New Testament,* however, was only gradually formed, and some time elapsed before it was completed. In the course of the second century the four gospels were received by the church in the form in which we now have them.(4) On the contrary, the gospels of the heretics,(5) as they were called, were rejected. At the close of the present period the Acts of the Apostles, the 13 Epistles of Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, which however only one part of the church considered as a work of Paul,(6) and, lastly, the first Epistle of John, and the first Epistle of Peter, had been admitted into the Canon. With regard to the canonical authority of the second and third Epistles of John, the Epistles of James, Jude, and 2 Peter, and, lastly, of the Book of Revelation, the opinions were yet for some time divided.(7) On the other hand, some other writings which are not now considered as forming a part of the Canon, viz. the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement, and the Shepherd of Hermas, were held by some (especially Clement and Origen) in equal esteem with the Scriptures, and quoted as such.(8)

---

(1) A difference of opinion obtained only in reference to the use of certain Greek writings of later origin (libri ecclesiastici, Apocrypha.) The Jews themselves had already made a distinction between the Canon of the Egyptian Jews, and the

Canon of the Jews of Palestine, comp. *Münscher*, Handbuch. vol. i. p. 240. ss., and the introductions to the O. Test. Melito of Sardis (in Euseb. iv. 26.) and Origen (ibid. vi. 25.) give enumerations of the books of the O. Test. which nearly coincide. [*Lardner*, ii. p. 158, 159; 493—513. *Stuart*, critical hist. and defence of the O. Test. Canon, p. 431, ss.] The difference between what was original, and what had been added in later times, was less striking to those who, being unacquainted with the Hebrew, used only the Greek version. Justin M. does not quote the apocrypha of the O. Test. though he follows the Septuagint version; comp. *Semisch*, II. p. 3, ss.

(2) Comp. *Neander's* Gnostische Systeme, p. 276, ss. *Baur*, Christliche Gnosis, p. 240, ss. The Clementine Homilies also regarded many statements in the O. Test. as contrary to truth, and drew attention to the contradictions which are found there, Hom iii. 10. 642, and other passages. Comp. *Credner*, l. c. and *Baur*, p. 317, ss. pp. 366, 367. [*Lardner*, viii. 485—489. *Neander*, l. c. ii. p. 122, 123. *Norton*, l. c. iii. p. 238.]

(3) It is well known that the words εὐαγγέλιον, εὐαγγελιστής, had a very different meaning in primitive Christianity; comp. the lexicons to the N. Test. and *Suicer*, Thes. pp. 1220 a. 1234.—*Justin M.*, however, remarks, (Apol. i. c. 66.) that the writings which he called the ἀπομνημονεύματα of the Apostles, were also called εὐαγγέλια. But it has been questioned whether we have to understand by εὐαγγέλια the four canonical gospels; see *Schwegler*, nachapostol. zeitalter, p. 216, ss. Concerning these ἀπομνημ., and the earliest collections of the Gospel-narratives, the Diatesseron of Tatian, etc. comp. the introductions to the N. Test. [*Gieseler*, Ueber die Entstehung und frühesten Schicksale der Evangel. 1818. *Lardner, N.* On the Credibility of the Gospel history. (Works, i. iv. v. to p. 251.) *Norton, A.*, On the Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. i. *Tholuck, A.*, in *Kitto*, l. c. art. Gospel.]

(4) *Irenæus*, adv. Hær. iii. 11. 7. attempts to explain the number four from cosmico-metaphysical reasons: Ἐπειδὴ τέσσαρα κλίματα τοῦ κοσμοῦ, ἐν ᾧ ἐσμὲν, εἰσὶ, καὶ τέσσαρα καθολικὰ πνεύματα, κατέσπαρται δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς. Στύλος δὲ καὶ στήριγμα ἐκκλησίας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς κ.τ.λ. Tertull. adv. Marc. iv. 2. 5. Clement of Alex. in Euseb. vi. 13. Origen in tom i. in Johannem, Opp. iv. p. 5. For further testimonies of antiquity comp.

the introductions (*de Wette*, p. 103.) [and the works of *Lardner* in particular.]

(5) Orig. Hom. i. in Luc. Opp. T. iii. p. 933. multi conati sunt scribere evangelia, sed non omnes recepti, etc. [The principal spurious gospels are the following: The Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus; the Gospel of Thomas the Israelite; the Prot-evangelion of James; the Gospel of the Nativity of Mary; the Gospel of Nicodemus, or the Acts of Pilate; the Gospel of Marcion; the Gospel of the Hebrews (most probably the same with that of the Nazarenes), and the Gospel of the Egyptians.] Comp. the introductions to the N. Test., and the treatises of *Schneckenburger*, *Hahn*, etc. *Fabricius*, Codex apocryph. N. Test. iii. Hamb. 1719, and *Thilo, D. I. C.*, Cod. apocr. N. Test. Lipsiæ, 1832. *Ullmann*, historisch oder mythisch. [*Lardner*, Works, ii. 91—93, 236, 250, 251; iv. 97, 106, 131, 463; viii. 524—535. *Norton*, l. c. iii. p. 214—286. *Wright, W.*, in Kitto, l. c. art. Gospels, spurious, where the literature is given.]

(6) Comp. *Bleek*, Einleitung in den Briefe an die Hebräer. Berlin, 1828. *De Wette*, Einleitung ins N. Test. ii. p. 247. [*Stuart's* Comment. on the Epistle to the Heb. 2 vols. Lond. 1828. *Alexander, W. L.*, in Kitto, l. c. sub voce, where the literature is given.]

(7) The Canon of Origen in Euseb. vi. 25. [*Lardner*, ii. 493—513.] The controversy on the Book of Revelation was connected with the controversy on millennarianism. Comp. *Lücke*, Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis, und die gesammte apokryphische Litteratur. Bonn. 1832, p. 261, ss. [**Davidson, S.*, in Kitto, l. c. sub voce Revelation. *Stuart*, Comment. on the Apocalypse, I. p. 290, ss.]

8) Clem. Strom. i. 7, p. 339. ii. 6, p. 445. ii. 7, p. 447. (ii. 15. ii. 18.) iv. 17, p. 609. v. 12, p. 693. vi. 8, pp. 772, 773. Orig. Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. Opp. iv. p. 683. (Comment. in Matth. Opp. iii. p. 644.) Hom. 88. in Num. T. ii. p. 249.—Contra Celsum i. 1. § 63. Opp. i. 378. (Comment. in Joh. iv. p. 153.) de princ. ii. 3. T. i. p. 82. Euseb. iii. 16. *Münscher*, Handbuch, i. p. 289. *Möhler*, Patrologie, i. p. 87. [*Lardner*, ii. 18. 247. 528; ii. p. 186, 187; 249. 303. 304. 530—532.]

§ 32.

INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Sonntag, G. F. N., doctrina inspirationis ejusque ratio, historica et usus popularis, Heidelberg, 1810. 8.—*Rudelbach, A. G.*, die Lehre von der Inspiration der heiligen Schrift, mit Berücksichtigung der neuesten Untersuchungen darüber von *Schleiermacher*, *Twesten* und *Steudel.* (Zeitschrift für die gesammte lutherische Theologie und Kirche, edited by Rudelbach and Guerike, 1840, i. 1.) *Credner*, de librorum N. T. inspiratione quid statuerint Christiani ante seculum tertium medium, Jen. 1828. *W. Grimm*, Inspiration, in Gruber and Ersch, Encyclop. sect. ii. vol. xix.

That the prophets and Apostles taught under the influence of the Holy Spirit, was the general belief of the ancient church, and had its foundation in the testimony of Scripture itself.(1) But according to this view inspiration was by no means confined to the dead letter. We find that the Jews generally believed in the verbal inspiration of their sacred writings, before the Canon of the N. Test. was completed, at a time when the living source of prophecy had ceased to operate. It is very probable that the theory of verbal inspiration was in some degree mixed up with the heathen notions concerning the μαντική (art of soothsaying),(2) but it did not spring from them. It developed itself in a singular form in the story of the origin of the Septuagint version, which was current even among many Christian writers.(3) The Fathers, however, differed in their opinions respecting inspiration; some took it in a more restricted, others in a more comprehensive sense.(4) But they were generally more inclined to admit verbal inspiration in the case of the Old, than of the New Test. We find, however, some whose views on the inspiration of the N. Test. writings were very positive, (5) and who in their support frequently appealed to the connection existing between the Old and the New Testaments,(6) and consequently between the writings of which they are respectively composed. *Origen* goes to the opposite extreme, and maintains that there had been no sure criterion of the inspiration of the O. Test. before the manifestation of Christ, but that the inspiration in question only follows from the Christian mode of perception.(7) But all parties insisted more particularly on the practical importance of the Scriptures, the richness of Divine wisdom clothed in unadorned, beautiful simplicity, as tending to promote the edification of believers.(8)

(1) 2 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Pet. i. 19–21.

(2) *Philo* was the first writer who transferred the ideas of the ancients concerning the μαντική to the prophets of the O. Test., de spec. legg. iii. ed. *Mangey*, ii. 343, quis div. rerum hær. *Mangey*, i 510, 511, de præm. et pœn. ii. 417, comp. *Gfrörer*, l. c. p. 54, ss. *Dähne*, l. c. p. 58. *Josephus*, on the other hand, adopts the more limited view, or verbal inspiration, contra Apion, i. 7, 8.—The idea of the μαντική was carried out in all its consequences by one section of the Christian church, viz. the Montanists, who attached principal importance to the unconscious state of the person filled with the Spirit, comp. *Schwegler*, Montanismus, p. 99. Allusions to it are also found in the writings of some Fathers, especially of *Athenagoras*, Leg. c. 9: Κατ' ἔκστασιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν κινήσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος.—Comp. Tert. advers. Marc. iv. c. 22.—*Origen* speaks very decidedly against it; contra Cels. vii. 4. Opp. i. p. 596.

(3) The account given by Aristeas was repeated with more or less numerous additions and embellishments by other writers, comp. *Josephus*, Antiq. xii. c. 2. Philo de vita Mos. 660. *Stahl*, in Eichhorn's Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur, i. p. 260, ss. *Eichhorn*, Einleitung ins Alte Test. § 159–338. *Rosenmüller*, Handbuch für Litteratur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese, ii. p. 334, ss. *Jahn*, Einletung ins Alte Test. § 33–67. *Berthold*, § 154–190. *De Wette*, i. p. 58. *Münscher*, Handbuch, i. p. 307, ss. *Gfrörer*, p. 49. *Dähne*, i. 57, ii. 1, ss. [*Davidson, S.*, Lectures on Biblical Criticism, Edinb. 1839, p. 35–44. The same in *Kitto*, Cyclop. of Bibl. Literat. art. Septuagint.] According to Philo even the grammatical faults of the LXX. are inspired, and offer a wide field of speculation to the allegorical interpreter, *Dähne*, i. p. 58.

Comp. Justin M. Coh. ad Græc. c. 13. Irenæus, iii. 21. Clem. of Alex. Strom. i. 21, p. 410. *Clement* perceives in the Greek version of the original the hand of providence, because it prevented the Gentiles from pleading ignorance in excuse of their sins, Strom. i. 7, p. 338.

(4) The apostolical Fathers speak of inspiration in very general terms; in quoting passages from the O. Test., they use indeed the phrase: λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, or similar expressions, but they do not give any more definite explanation regarding the manner of this inspiration. Comp. *Clement of R.* in several places; *Ignat.* ad Magn. c. 8, ad Philadelph. c. 5, etc. *Sonntag*, doctrina inspirationis, § 16. *Justin M.* is the first author in whose writings we meet with a more definite, doctrinal explanation of the process which is thought to take place, Cohort. ad Græc. § 8: Οὔτε γὰρ φύσει οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾳ οὕτω μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα γινώσκειν ἀνθρώποις δυνατὸν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἄνδρας τηλικαῦτα κατελθούσῃ δωρεᾷ, οἷς οὐ λόγων ἐδέησε τέχνης, οὐδὲ τοῦ ἐριστικῶς τι καὶ φιλονείκως εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ καθαροὺς ἑαυτοὺς τῇ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος παρασχεῖν ἐνεργείᾳ, ἵν' αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιὸν πλῆκτρον, ὥσπερ ὀργάνῳ κιθάρας τινὸς ἢ λύρας, τοῖς δικαίοις ἀνδράσι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν θείων ἡμῖν καὶ οὐρανίων ἀποκαλύψῃ γνῶσιν· διὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν ὥσπερ ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος καὶ μιᾶς γλώττης καὶ περὶ θεοῦ, καὶ περὶ κόσμου κτίσεως, καὶ περὶ πλάσεως ἀνθρώπου, καὶ περὶ ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς ἀθανασίας καὶ τῆς μετὰ τὸν βίον τοῦτον μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι κρίσεως, καὶ περὶ πάντων ὧν ἀναγκαῖον ἡμῖν ἐστιν εἰδέναι, ἀκολούθως καὶ συμφώνως ἀλλήλοις ἐδίδαξαν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ταῦτα διαφόροις τόποις τε καὶ χρόνοις τὴν θείαν ἡμῖν διδασκαλίαν παρεσχηκότες. Does Justin maintain in this passage that the writers were altogether passive when under the influence of the Holy Spirit? We presuppose that a lyre is constructed according to the principles of acoustics, and properly tuned: for it is not likely that the plectron should produce sounds out of a mere piece of wood! On the other hand, see *Semisch*, p. 18, who identifies the view of Justin with that of the Montanists, and *Schwegler*, Montan. p. 101. From the conclusion at which he arrives, it is also apparent that he limits inspiration to what is religious, to what is necessary to be known in order to be saved.—The theory proposed in the third book of *Theophilus ad Autolycum*, c. 23, has more regard to external things: he ascribes the correctness of the Mosaic chronology, and subjects of a similar nature, to Divine inspiration.—Comp. also *Athenag.* leg. c. 7, and c. 9, (where the same figure occurs: ὡσεὶ αὐλητὴς αὐλὸν ἐμπνεύσαι.)—The views of *Irenæus* on inspiration were equally strict and positive, advers. Hæret. ii. 28: Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt

quippe a verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ, and other passages contained in the third book. *Tert.* de præscript. hæret. 8, 9. advers. Marc. iii. 6. Apol. c. 18, (comp. however, § 34.) *Clement of Alexandr.* calls the sacred Scriptures in different places γραφὰς θεοπνεύστας, or quotes τὸ γὰρ στόμα κυρίου, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐλάλησε ταῦτα, etc. Coh. ad Gr. p. 66. 86; ibidem p. 67 he quotes Jeremiah, and then corrects himself in these words: μᾶλλον δὲ ἐν Ἱερεμίᾳ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, etc. and likewise Pæd. i. 7. p. 134: Ὁ νόμος διὰ Μώσεως ἐδόθη, οὐχὶ ὑπὸ Μώσεως, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ λόγου, διά Μώσεως δὲ τοῦ θεράποντος αὐτοῦ. On the infallibility of the inspired writings, see Strom. ii. p. 432. vii. 16. p. 897. *Cyprian* calls all the books of the Bible divinæ plenitudinis fontes, advers, Jud. præf. p. 18. and uses in his quotations the same phraseology which Clement employs, de unit. eccles. p. 111. de opere et eleem. p. 201.

(5) The doctrine of the inspiration, as set forth in the N. Test. writings, stood in close connection with the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and his work. But the Fathers did not think so much of the exertions of the Apostles as *writers*, as of the power which was communicated to them, to *teach*, and to perform miracles, and looked upon the latter as peculiarly the work of the Spirit. It was not till the writings of the N. Test. had been collected into *one* Codex, that they adopted concerning the N. Test. those views which had long been entertained concerning the verbal inspiration of the O. Test. *Tertullian* first makes mention of this Codex as *Novum Instrumentum*, or (quod magis usui est dicere) *Novum Testamentum*, adv. Marc. iv. 1., and he lays so much stress upon the reception of the entire Codex as a criterion of orthodoxy, that he denies the Holy Spirit to all who do not receive the Acts of the Apostles as canonical (de præscr. Hær. 22.) *Justin M.* speaks in more general terms of the Divine inspiration, and miraculous power of the Apostles, Apol. i. c. 39, and the spiritual gifts of Christians, dialog. cum Tryph. § 88. Tertullian, however, draws a distinction between these two kinds of inspiration, viz. the apostolical, and that which is common to all believers, (de exhort. castit. c. 4.), and represents the latter as only partial; but he does not refer the former kind of inspiration to the mere act of writing.—But in the writings of *Irenæus* we find a more definite allusion to *the extraordinary assistance of the Holy Spirit which was granted to the Sacred penmen*, with a special reference to the N. Test. writers, adv.

Hær. iii. 16. § 2: Potuerat dicere Matthæus: *Jesu* vero generatio sic erat; sed prævidens spiritus sanctus depravatores et præmuniens contra fradulentiam eorum, per Matthæum ait: *Christi* autem generatio sic erat.

(6) *Iren.* adv. Hær. iv. 9. p. 237: Non alterum quidem vetera, alterum vero proferentem nova docuit, sed unum et eundem. Pater familias enim Dominus est, qui universæ domui paternæ dominatur, et servis quidem et adhuc indisciplinatis condignam tradens legem; liberis autem et fide justificatis congruentia dans præcepta, et filiis adaperiens suam hæreditatem......Ea autem, quæ de thesauro proferuntur nova et vetera, sine contradictione duo Testamenta dicit: vetus quidem, quod ante fuerat, legislatio; novum autem, quæ secundum Evangelium est conversatio, ostendit, de qua David ait: *Cantate Domino canticum novum*, etc. Comp. iii. 11. In his fragments he compares the two pillars of the house under the ruins of which Samson killed himself and the Philistines, to the two Testaments which overthrew paganism. Clem. Al. Pæd. p. 307; Ἄμφω δὲ τὼ νόμον διηκόνουν τῷ λόγῳ εἰς παιδαγωγίαν τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ὁ μὲν διὰ Μώσεως, ὁ δὲ δι' Ἀποστόλων. Comp. Strom. i. 5. p. 331. iii. 10. p. 543.

(7) *Orig.* de princip. iv. c. 6. Opp. i. p. 161: Λεκτέον δὲ, ὅτι τὸ τῶν προφητικῶν λόγων ἔνθεον καὶ τὸ πνευματικὸν τοῦ Μώσεως νόμου ἔλαμψεν ἐπιδημήσαντος Ἰησοῦ. Ἐναργῆ γὰρ παραδείγματα περί τοῦ θεοπνεύστους εἶναι τὰς παλαιὰς γραφὰς πρὸ τῆς ἐπιδημίας τοῦ Χρίστοῦ παραστῆσαι οὐ πάνυ δυνατὸν ἦν, ἀλλ' ἡ Ἰησοῦ ἐπιδημία δυναμένους ὑποπτεύεσθαι τὸν νόμον καί τοὺς προφήτας ὡς οὐ θεῖα, εἰς τοὐμφανὲς ἤγαγεν, ὡς οὐρανίῳ χάριτι ἀναγεγραμμένα. From this point of view Origen acknowledges the inspiration of both the Old and the New Testaments, de princ. proœm. c. 8. Opp. i. p.18. lib. iv. ab init. contra Cels. v. 60. Opp. i. p. 623. Hom. in Jerem. Opp. T. iii. p. 282: Sacra volumina spiritus plenitudinem spirant, nihilque est sive in lege, sive in evangelio, sive in apostolo, quod non a plenitudine divinæ majestatis descendat. Comp. Comm. in Matth. T. iii. p. 732, where, in reference to the different relations of the miraculous cure of the blind men, (Matth. xx. 30-34; Mark x. 46-52; Luke xviii. 35-43.) he assumes that the evangelists had been preserved from any fault of memory; but in order to account for the apparent discrepancies, he is obliged to have recourse to allegorical interpretation. In the 27th Hom. in Num. Opp. T. ii. p. 365, he further maintains that (because of this inspiration) nothing superfluous

could have found its way into the sacred Scriptures, and that we must seek for Divine illumination and direction, when we meet with difficulties. Comp. Hom. in Exod. i. 4. Opp. T. ii. p. 131: Ego credens verbis Domini mei Jesu Christi, in lege et Prophetis iota quidem unum aut apicem non puto esse mysteriis vacuum, nec puto aliquid horum transire posse, donec omnia fiant.—Philocalia (Cantabrig. 1658,) p. 19: *Πρέπει δὲ τὰ ἅγια γράμματα πιστεύειν μηδεμίαν κεραῖαν ἔχειν κενὴν σοφίας Θεοῦ· ὁ γὰρ ἐντειλάμενος ἐμοὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ λέγων, οὐκ ὀφθήσῃ ἐνώπιόν μου κενός* (Exod. xxxiv. 20.) *πολλῷ πλέον αὐτὸς οὐδὲν κενὸν ἐρεῖ.* Comp. *Schnitzer*, p. 286. But Origen softened the harshness of his theory partly, as has already been indicated, by allegorical interpretation, (comp. the subsequent §), partly by assuming (as was frequently done even in later times) that God, like a teacher, accommodates himself to the degree of civilization in different ages, contra Cels. iv. 71, T. i. p. 556.

(8) *Irenæus* compares the sacred Scriptures to the treasure which was hid in a field, adv. Hær. iv. 25, 26, and recommends their perusal also to the laity, but under the direction of the presbyters, iv. 32. *Clement of Alexandr.* describes their simplicity, and the beneficial effects which they are calculated to produce, Coh. p. 66: *Γραφαὶ δὲ αἱ θεῖαι καὶ πολιτεῖαι σώφρονες, σύντομοι σωτηρίας ὅδοι, γυμναὶ κομμωτικῆς καὶ τῆς ἐκτὸς καλλιφωνίας καὶ στωμυλίας καὶ κολακείας ὑπάρχουσαι ἀνιστῶσιν ἀγχόμενον ὑπὸ κακίας τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὑπεριδοῦσαι τὸν ὄλισθον τὸν βιωτικὸν, μιᾷ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ φωνῇ πολλὰ θεραπεύουσαι, ἀποτρέπουσαι μὲν ἡμᾶς τῆς ἐπιζημίου ἀπάτης, προτρέπουσαι δὲ ἐμφανῶς εἰς προὖπτον σωτηρίαν.* Comp. ibid. p. 71: *Ἱερὰ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς τὰ ἱεραποιοῦντα καὶ θεοποιοῦντα γράμματα κ. τ. λ.* Clement did not confine this sanctifying power to the mere letter of Scripture, but thought that the *λογικοὶ νόμοι* had been written, not only *ἐν πλαξὶ λιθίναις, ἀλλ' ἐν καρδίαις ἀνθρώπων*, Pæd. iii. p. 307, so that at least the effects produced by the Bible depend on the susceptibility of the mind. The language of Origen is similar, contra Cels. vi. 2, p. 630: *Φησὶ δ' ὁ θεῖος λόγος, οὐκ αὔταρκες εἶναι τὸ λεγόμενον (κἂν καθ' αὐτὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ πιστικώτατον ᾖ) πρὸς τὸ καθικέσθαι ἀνθρωπίνης ψυχῆς, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ δύναμίς τις θεόθεν δοθῇ τῷ λέγοντι, καὶ χάρις ἐπανθήσῃ τοῖς λεγομένοις, καὶ αὕτη οὐκ ἀθεεὶ ἐγγινομένη τοῖς ἀνυσίμως λέγουσι.*

§ 33.

BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION.

Olshausen, über tiefern Schriftsinn, Königsberg, 1824. *Rosenmüller*, historia interpretat. N. Test. T. iii. *Ernesti*, *J. A.*, de Origine interpretationis grammaticæ auctore, opusc. crit. Lugd. 1764. *Hagenbach*, Observat. circa Origenis methodum interpretandæ S. S. Bas. 1823. *Thomasius*, Origenes, Appendix I.—[*Davidson*, *S.*, Sacred Hermeneutics developed and applied; including a Hist. of Biblical Interpretation from the earliest of the Fathers to the Reform. Edinb. 1843. Comp. also *Credner*, *K. A.*, in *Kitto's* Cyclop. of Biblical Literature sub voce.]

The tendency to allegorical interpretation (1) was connected in a twofold manner with the doctrine of verbal inspiration. Some writers endeavoured to *bring* as much as possible *into* the letter of the sacred writings, either on mystico-speculative, or on practico-religious grounds; others from a rationalistico-apologetical tendency were anxious to *explain away* all that might lead to conclusions alike offensive to human reason, and unworthy of the Deity, if taken in their literal sense. This may be best seen in the works of *Origen*, who, after the example of *Philo*,(2) and of several of the Fathers, especially of *Clement*,(3) adopted three modes of interpretation, the *grammatical*, *anagogical*, *and allegorical*.(4) The simple and modest mode of interpretation, adopted by *Irenæus*, who defers to God all that is above human understanding,(5) forms a striking contrast with the allegorizing tendency, which can find everything in the Scriptures.

(1) "*Considering the high opinion regarding the inspiration of the sacred writings, and the dignity of what is revealed in them, we should expect as a matter of course, to meet with careful interpreters who would diligently investigate the exact meaning of every part of Holy Writ. But the very opposite has taken place. Inspiration is done away with by that most arbitrary of all modes of interpretation, the allegorical, of which we may consider Philo the best representative.*" (*Gfrörer*, Geschichte

des Urchristenthums, i. p. 69. in reference to Philo.) However much this may surprise us at first sight, we shall find that the connection between the theory of inspiration, and the mode of interpretation which accompanies it, is by no means unnatural; both have one common source, viz. the assumption that there is a very great difference between the Bible, and other books. That which has come down from heaven, must be interpreted according to its heavenly origin; must be looked upon with other eyes, and touched with other hands than profane. Comp. *Dähne*, über Philo, p. 60. In this period we observe something similar relative to the Word to what took place afterwards with regard to the Sacraments. As baptismal water was thought to possess more excellent qualities than common water, and the bread used in the Lord's supper to be different from common bread, so the letter of the Bible, once encircled by the magic ring of inspiration, became itself a magic hieroglyphic, to decipher which a magic key was needed.

(2) Comp *Gfrörer*, *Dähne*, l. c. [and *Conybeare, J. J.* The Bampton Lecture for the year 1824, being an attempt to trace the history and to ascertain the limits of the secondary, and spiritual interpret. of Script. Oxf. 1824. *Davidson*, Sacred Hermeneutics, pp. 63, 64.]

(3) Examples of allegorical and typical interpretation abound in the writings of the apostolical and earlier Fathers, see § 29. note 3. [Comp. *Davidson*, Sacred Hermen. p. 71, ss. Barnabas, 1.7: The two goats (Levit xvi.) were to be fair and perfectly alike; both therefore typified the one Jesus, who was to suffer for us. The circumstance of one being driven forth into the wilderness, the congregation spitting upon it and pricking it; whilst the other, instead of being accursed, was offered upon the altar to God, symbolised the death and sufferings of Jesus. The washing of the entrails with vinegar, denoted the vinegar mixed with gall which was given to Jesus on the cross. The scarlet wool, put about the head of one of the goats, signified the scarlet robe put upon Christ before his crucifixion. The taking off the scarlet wool, and placing it on a thorn-bush, refers to the fate of Christ's church. Clement of Alex. lib. v. p. 557: " The candlestick situated south of the altar of incense signified the movements of the seven stars making circuits southward. From each side of the candlestick projected three branches with lights in them, because the sun placed in the midst of the other planets gives

light both to those above and under him by a kind of divine music. The golden candlestick has also another enigma, not only in being a figure of the sign of Christ, but also in the circumstance of giving light in many ways and parts to such as believe and hope in him, by the instrumentality of the things at first created." Comp. also pp. 74. 75. 79. 80.] In order to form a correct estimate of this mode of interpretation comp. *Möhler*, Patrologie, i. p. 64: "*It may be, that the system of interpretation adopted by the earlier Fathers in many respects is not agreeable to our notions of interpretation; but we should remember that our mode of looking at things differs from theirs in more than one point. They knew nothing, thought of nothing, felt nothing, but Christ—is it then surprising, that they met him everywhere, even without seeking him? In the present high state of civilization we are scarcely able to form a correct idea of the mind of those times, in which the great object of commentators was, to show the connection between the Old and the New Covenant in the most satisfactory manner, and in the most vivid colours.*" The earlier Fathers indulged almost unconsciously in this mode of interpreting; but *Clement of Alex.* attempts to establish a theory asserting that the Mosaic laws have a threefold, or even a fourfold sense, τετραχῶς δε ἡμῖν ἐκληπτέον τοῦ νόμου τὴν βούλησιν. Strom. i. 28. (some read τριχῶς instead of τετραχῶς.) [Comp. *Davidson*, l. c. p. 79.]

(4) *Origen* supposes that Scripture has a threefold sense corresponding to the trichotomous division of man into body, soul, and spirit (comp. § 54); in confirmation of this view he appeals to Prov. xxii. 20, 21; [1 Cor. ii. 6, 7 and other passages,] and the Shepherd of Hermas which he values equally with Scripture. This threefold sense may be divided into 1. the *grammatical*, [σωματικός] = body; 2. the *moral*, [ψυχικός] = soul; and 3. the *mystical*, [πνευματικός] = spirit. The literal sense, however, he asserts, cannot always be taken, but in certain cases it must be spiritualized by allegorical interpretation, especially in those places which contain either something indifferent in a religious aspect (genealogies, etc.), or immoral things (*e. g.* the account of Lot's incest, of Abraham's two wives, etc.), or what is unworthy of the dignity of God (the anthropomorphitic narratives in the book of Genesis, etc.); [comp. the mode in which Philo proceeded, *Davidson*, l. c. p. 63, 64.] But Origen found offensive things not only in the Old, but also in the New Testament.

Thus he declared the narrative of the temptation of our Saviour to be a mere allegory, because he could not solve the difficulties which it presents to the historical interpreter. [The gospels also abound in expressions of this kind; as when the devil is said to have taken Jesus to a high mountain.—For who could believe, if he read such things with the least degree of attention, that the kingdoms of the Persians, Scythians, Indians, and Parthians, were seen with the bodily eye, and with as great honour as kings are looked upon? *Davidson*, l. c. p. 99.] He also thought that some precepts, as Luke x. 4. Matth. v. 39. 1 Cor. vii. 18. could be taken in their literal sense only by foolish men (ἀκεραίοις).—He does not indeed deny the reality of most of the miracles, but he prizes much more highly the allegory which they include (comp. § 29, note 10); de princ. lib. iv. § 8—27, he gives the most complete exhibition of his theory; comp. also his exegetical works, and the above mentioned treatises.—[*Davidson*, l. c. p. 97—105].—Both tendencies above spoken of, that of bringing in, and that of explaining away, are obviously exhibited in the writings of Origen. Therefore, the remark of *Lücke* (Hermeneutik. p. 39.) "*that a rationalistic tendency, of which Origen himself was not conscious, may account in part for his addiction to allegorical interpretation,*" can be easily reconciled with the apparently contrary supposition, that mysticism was the cause of it. "*The letter kills, but the spirit quickens; this is the principle of Origen. But who does not see that the spirit can become too powerful, kill the letter, and take its place?*" *Edgar Quinet* on Strauss (Revue des deux mondes 1838.)

(5) *Irenæus* also proceeded on the assumption that the Scriptures throughout were full of profound meanings, adv. Hær. iv. 18: Nihil enim otiosum, nec sine signo, neque sine argumento apud eum, and made use of typical interpretation. Nevertheless he saw the errors to which allegorizing leads, and condemned it in the Gnostics, adv. Hær. i. 3, 6. We are as little able to understand the abundance of nature, as the superabundance of Scripture, ibid. ii. 28: Nos autem secundum quod minores sumus et novissimi a verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus, secundum hoc et scientia mysteriorum ejus indigemus. Et non est mirum, si in spiritalibus et cœlestibus et in his quæ habent revelari, hoc patimur nos: quandoquidem etiam eorum quæ ante pedes sunt (dico autem quæ sunt in hac creatura, quæ et con-

trectantur a nobis et videntur et sunt nobiscum) multa fugerunt nostram scientiam, et Deo hæc ipsa committimus. Oportet enim eum præ omnibus præcellere......Εἰ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς κτίσεως ἔνια μὲν ἀνάκειται τῷ θεῷ, ἔνια δὲ καὶ εἰς γνῶσιν ἐλήλυθε τὴν ἡμετέραν, τί χαλεπὸν, εἰ καὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ζητουμένων, ὅλων τῶν γραφῶν πνευματικῶν οὐσῶν, ἔνια μὲν ἐπιλύομεν κατὰ χάριν θεοῦ, ἔνια δὲ ἀνακείσεται τῷ θεῷ, καὶ οὐ μόνον αἰῶνι ἐν τῷ νυνὶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι; ἵνα ἀεὶ μὲν ὁ θεὸς διδάσκῃ, ἄνθρωπος δὲ διὰ παντὸς μανθάνῃ παρὰ Θεοῦ.

§ 34.

TRADITION.

Pelt, über Tradition in den theologischen Mitarbeiten, Kiel 1813, comp. also § 30, [*Bennett,* l. c. p. 95—106.]

Notwithstanding the high esteem in which Scripture was held, the authority of tradition was not altogether disregarded. On the contrary, in the controversies with heretics, Scripture was thought to be insufficient to combat them, because it maintains its true position, and can be correctly interpreted (*i. e.* according to the spirit of the church) only in close connection with the tradition of the church.(1) Different opinions obtained concerning the nature of tradition. The view taken by *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* was of a positive, realistic kind; according to them the truth could not be obtained without some external historico-geographical connection with the mother churches.(2) The writers of the Alexandrian school entertained more idealistic opinions; they saw in the unhindered and more spiritual exchange of ideas the fresh and ever living source from which we must draw the wholesome water of sound doctrine.(3) It must, however, be acknowledged, that the idea of a secret doctrine(4) which prevailed in the Alexandrian school, and was said to have been transmitted along with the publicly received truth from the times of Christ and his Apostles, betrayed a Gnostic tendency which might easily hinder the adaptation of Christianity to all classes of society. On the other hand, the new revelations of the Montanists set aside all historical tradition.(5) The view which *Cyprian* takes of tradition is peculiar to himself; he submits it to the test of Scripture, and distinguishes human tradition (usage) from divine instruction.(6)

(1) On the necessity of tradition see *Irenæus,* i. 10. (p. 49, M.) ii. 35. p. 171. iii. Pref. c. 1–6. c. 21. iv. 20, 26, 32. (*Orelli,* i. Programme, p. 20.) The remark is worthy of observation, iii. 4. that the nations had been converted to Christianity, not in the first instance by the *Scripture* (sine charta et atramento), but by means of the presence of the Holy Spirit in their hearts, and the faithfully preserved tradition. See *Tert* adv. Marc. iii. 6, v. 5, and particularly de præscriptione Hæreticorum, where he denies to heretics the right of using Scripture in argument with the orthodox. Comp. c. 13, seq. c. 19. Ergo non ad scripturas provocandum est, nec in his constituendum certamen, in quibus aut nulla, aut incerta victoria est, aut par (*var.* parum) incertæ. Nam esti non ita evaderet conlatio scripturarum, ut utramque partem parem sisteret, ordo rerum desiderabat, illud prius proponi quod nunc solum disputandum est: quibus competat fides ipsa: cujus sint scripturæ; a quo et per quos et quando et quibus sit tradita disciplina, qua fiunt Christiani. Ubi enim apparuerit esse veritatem et disciplinæ et fidei christianæ, illic erit veritas scripturarum et expositionum et omnium traditionum Christianarum. Comp. c. 37: Qui estis, quando et unde venistis, quid in meo agitis, non mei? The renouncing of tradition is, according to Tertullian, the source of the mutilation, and corruption of Scripture, comp. c. 22 and 38. But even in a state of integrity Scripture is not able, on its own account, to overthrow heresies: on the contrary, according to God's providential arrangement, it becomes to heretics the source of new errors, comp. c. 40, 42.—*Clement of Alex.* expresses himself thus (Stromata, vii. 15, p. 887): It should be no more impossible for an honest man to lie, than for a believer to depart from the rule of faith which is laid down by the church; it is necessary to follow those who already possess the truth. As the companions of Ulysses, having been bewitched by Circe, behaved like beasts, so he who renounces tradition ceases to be a man of

God, Strom. 16, p. 890.—*Origen* de princ. prooem. i. p. 47: Servetur vero ecclesiastica prædicatio per successionis ordinem ab Apostolis tradita usque ad præsens in ecclesiis permanens, illa sola credenda est veritas, quæ in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat tramite.

(2) *Iren.* iii. 4. (2. p. 178. M.): Quid enim? Et si de aliqua modica quæstione disceptatio esset, nonne oporteret in antiquissimas recurrere ecclesias, in quibus Apostoli conversati sunt et ab iis de præsenti quæstione sumere quod certum et re liquidum est. Quid autem, si neque Apostoli quidem scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis, quibus committebant ecclesias? etc. *Tertul.* præscr. c. 20: Dehinc (Apostoli) in orbem profecti eandem doctrinam ejusdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt, et proinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt, a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinæ ceteræ exinde ecclesiæ mutuatæ sunt et quotidie mutuantur, ut ecclesiæ fiant, et per hoc et ipsæ apostolicæ deputantur, ut soboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. Omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. Itaque tot ac tantæ Ecclesiæ una est illa ab Apostolis prima, ex qua omnes, etc. Comp. c. 21.

(3) *Clem. Alex.* Strom. i. 1. p. 323: *Τὰ φρέατα ἐξαντλούμενα διειδέστερον ὕδωρ ἀναδίδωσι· τρέπεται δὲ εἰς φθορὰν, ὧν μεταλαμβάνει οὐδεὶς· καὶ τὸν σίδηρον ἡ χρῆσις καθαρώτερον φυλάσσει, ἡ δὲ ἀχρηστία ἰοῦ τούτῳ γεννητική. Συνελόντι γὰρ φάναι, ἡ συγγυμνασία ἕξιν ἐμποιεῖ ὑγιεινὴν καὶ πνεύμασι καὶ σώμασιν.*

(4) Ibid: *Αὐτίκα οὐ πολλοῖς ἀπεκάλυψεν (ὁ Ἰησοῦς) ἃ μὴ πολλῶν ἦν, ὀλίγοις δὲ οἷς προσήκειν ἠπίστατο, τοῖς οἵοις τε ἐκδέξασθαι καὶ τυπωθῆναι πρὸς αὐτά· τὰ δὲ ἀπόῤῥητα, καθάπερ ὁ θεὸς, λόγῳ πιστεύεται, οὐ γράμματι...... ἀλλὰ γὰρ τὰ μυστήρια μυστικῶς παραδίδοται, ἵνα ᾖ ἐν στόματι λαλοῦντος καὶ ὃ λαλεῖται· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἐν φωνῇ ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ νοεῖσθαι κ. τ. λ.* Comp. Euseb. h. e. ii. 1. *Origen* contra Cels. vi. § 6. Opp. T. i. p. 633. Comp. *Frommann, G. C. L. Th.*, de disciplina arcani, quæ in vetere ecclesia christiana obtinuisse fertur, Jen. 1833. 8.

(5) Comp. § 24.

(6) The opinion of *Cyprian* was developed in the controversy with the Romish bishop Stephen, who appealed to the Romish tradition in support of his views concerning the baptism of heretics. Cyprian, on the contrary, justly returned to the oldest tradition, viz. the Sacred Scriptures (divinæ traditionis caput et origo), Ep. 74, p. 215. In the same place, and in the same con-

nection he says: Consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est. Comp. Ep. 71, p. 194: Non est de consuetudine præscribendum, sed ratione vincendum. We must, however, remember that this controversy was carried on not so much about a dogma, as about a rite, and that as yet no definite meaning was attached to the term tradition. [*Bennett*, l. c. p. 105.] It is interesting to observe that, *e. g.* Irenæus does not as yet know any traditio humana within the church which could contradict in any way the traditio apostolica; [*Bennett*, l. c. p. 99.] In later times Tertullian combated the authority of custom with almost the same weapons as Cyprian; comp. de virgin. veland. 1: Christus veritatem se, non consuetudinem cognominavit. Quodcunque adversus veritatem sapit, hoc erit hæresis, etiam vetus consuetudo. *Huther*, Cyprian, p. 139, ss. *Rettberg*, p. 310. *Pelt*, l. c. *Gess*, die Einheit der Kirche im Sinne Cyprians, in den Studien der evangelischen Geistlichkeit Würtembergs, 1838, ii. 1, p. 149, ss.

It was the general opinion that *faith* (πίστις, fides) is the medium by which we apprehend the revelations made known to us either by Scripture or by tradition. The question, however, arose (especially in the Alexandrian school) in what relation the πίστις stands to the more developed γνῶσις? While *Irenæus* does not go beyond faith, but without excluding its scientific treatment (comp. *Duncker*, p, 16), the theologians of the Alexandrian school, *e. g.* *Clement*, endeavoured to assign a higher position to the γνῶσις. But we should mistake him, if we were to conclude, from some of his expressions, that he attached but an inferior value to the πίστις. In a certain sense he looked upon it rather as the perfection of knowledge (τελειότης μαθήσεως.) Pæd. i. 6, p. 115. Faith does not want any thing, it does not limp (as arguments do.) It has the promise, etc. Also according to Strom. i. 1, p. 320. faith is essentially necessary to a right apprehension of knowledge. It anticipates knowledge, ii. 1, p. 432. Comp ii. 4, p. 436: Κυριώτερον οὖν τῆς ἐπιστήμης ἡ πίστις καὶ ἐστὶν αὐτῆς κριτήριον. In the same place he distinguishes faith from mere conjecture, εἰκασία, which is related to faith, as a flatterer to a true friend, and a wolf to a dog.—Revelation (διδασκαλία) and faith depend on each other, as the throwing and catching of a ball in a game, Strom. ii. 6, p. 442.—On the other hand, Clement maintained the necessity of a *well instructed* faith (πίστις περὶ τὴν μάθησιν). Strom. i 6, p. 336, and insisted in general on an intimate connection between *πίστις* and *γνῶσις*, ii. 4, p. 436 : *Πιστὴ τοίνυν ἡ γνῶσις· γνωστὴ δὲ ἡ πίστις· ϑείᾳ τινὶ ἀκολουϑία τε καὶ ἀντακολουϑίᾳ γένεται.* Faith is described as an imperfect knowledge of the truth, *γνῶσις* is characterised as a " firm and stable demonstration of the things already apprehended by faith," Strom. vii. 10, p. 865, 66. From this point of view he valued knowledge more highly than faith, Strom. vi. 14, p. 794 : *Πλέον δέ ἐστι τοῦ πιστεῦσαι τὸ γνῶναι.* Nevertheless he knew how to discern this true gnosis from the false gnosis of the Gnostics, Strom. v. 6, p. 689, 12, p. 695, vi. 7, 771. Strom. vii. 10, p. 864, (here again faith appears as the basis of true knowledge.) On the different kinds of faith, see Strom. vi. 17, p. 820. Comp. *Neander*, de fidei gnoseosque idea secundum Clementem Alex. Heidelberg, 1811, 8. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 502, ss. [*Davidson*, l. c. p. 76, 77 ; p. 106–111.]—*Origen*, de princ. in procem. 3. Opp. i. 47 : Illud autem scire oportet, quoniam Sancti Apostoli fidem Christi prædicantes de quibusdam quidem, quæcunque necessaria crediderunt, omnibus manifestissime tradiderunt, rationem scilicet assertionis eorum relinquentes ab his inquirendam, qui Spiritus dona excellentia mererentur : de aliis vero dixerunt quidem, quia sint ; quomodo autem, aut unde sint, siluerunt, profecto ut studiosiores quique ex posteris suis, qui amatores essent sapientiæ, exercitium habere possent, in quo ingenii sui fructum ostenderent, hi videlicet qui dignos se et capaces ad recipiendam sapientiam præpararent.

SECOND SECTION.

THEOLOGY.

THE DOCTRINE OF GOD (INCLUDING THE DOCTRINE RESPECTING THE CREATION, AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD, THE DOCTRINE OF ANGELS AND OF DEMONS.)

§ 35.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

It can never be the object of any revealed religion to prove the existence of God, inasmuch as it always presupposes the conviction that there is a God. The idea of a personal God, who, as the creator of heaven and earth, rules over the human race, who has given the law, sent the prophets, and manifested himself in these last days by his son *Jesus Christ,* (1)existed already in the O. Test. but was now purified, perfected, and extended beyond the narrow limits of national interests in the Christian religion. In consequence, the believing Christian needed as little, as his Jewish contemporary, a proof of the existence of God. But in proportion as the truth and excellency of Christianity were more fully perceived, it became necessary, on the one hand, that the Christians should defend themselves, (apologetically) against the charge of Atheism which was frequently brought forward.(2) On the other, they had to demonstrate to the heathen (polemically,) that their pagan worship was false, and consequently in its very foundation amounted to a virtual denial of the living God (Atheism.)(3) When, therefore, the writings of the Fathers contain anything like a proof of the existence of God, we must take it as the sudden utterance of an overflowing heart, which gives vent to its feelings in a rhetorico-poetical form.(4) Sometimes we find that such statements are intimately connected with other definitions of the nature of God, with the doctrine of his unity, or with the doctrine concerning the creation and government of the world.(5) But the Fathers of this period generally returned to the innate consciousness of God's existence (testimonium animæ, λόγος σπερματικός) which may be traced even in the heathen,(6) and on the purity of which the knowledge of God depends.(7) With this they connected, but more in a popular than strictly scientific form, what is commonly called the physico-theological, or teleological proof, *i. e.* they inferred the existence of a creator from the works of creation.(8) More artificial proofs, such as the cosmological and the ontological were unknown in this period. Even the more profound thinkers of the Alexandrian school frankly acknowledged the impossibility of a proper proof of the existence of God, and the necessity of a Divine revelation.(9)

(1) The distinction, therefore, between *Theology* and *Christology* is only relative, and made for scientific purposes. The Christian idea of God always depends on faith in the Son in whom the Father manifests himself. We find, however, in the writings of some of the earliest Fathers (especially of Minucius Felix) a kind of theology which bears much resemblance to what was subsequently called *natural* theology, inasmuch as it is more reflecting than intuitive. Others (*e. g.* Clement) looked at every thing through the medium of the Logos; Strom. v. 12, p. 696, comp. also note 9.

(2) Comp. *e. g.* Minuc. Fel. Oct. c. 8, and with it cc. 17, 18, also the Edict. Antonini in Euseb. iv. 13; the phrase ὡς ἀθέων κατηγοροῦντες, however, may be differently interpreted. Comp. *Heinichen*, I. p. 328.

(3) This was done by all the apologists, each in his turn; comp. instead of all: Minuc. Fel. c. 20, ss. Tertullian, Apol. c. 8, de idolotatria. Cyprian, de idolorum vanitate etc.

(4 See the passage in *Clem. of Alex.* Cohort. 54: Θεὸς δὲ πῶς ἂν εἴποιμι ὅσα ποιεῖ; ὅλον ἰδὲ τὸν κόσμον· ἐκείνου ἔργον ἐστὶν καὶ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἥλιος καὶ ἄγγελοις καὶ ἄνθρωποι, ἔργα τῶν δακτύλων αὐτοῦ. Ὅση γε ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ; μόνον αὐτοῦ τὸ βούλημα κοσμοποιΐα· μόνος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνος ὄντως ἐστὶ Θεός. Ψιλῷ τῷ βούλεσθαι δημιουργεῖ, καὶ τῷ μόνον ἐθελῆσαι αὐτὸν ἕπεται τὸ γεγενῆσθαι κ. τ. λ. comp. Tert. Apol. c. 17, 18.

(5) Comp. the following §§.

(6) *Tertullian* advers. Judæos c. 2.: Cur etenim Deus universitatis conditor, mundi totius gubernator, hominis plasmator, universarum gentium sator, legem per Moysen uni populo dedisse credatur, et non omnibus gentibus attribuisse dicatur? et sqq. Comp. Apol. c. 17.: Vultis ex operibus ipsius tot ac talibus quibus continemur, quibus sustinemur, quibus oblectamur, etiam quibus exterremur? vultis ex animæ ipsius testimonio comprobemus? quæ licet carcere corporis pressa, licet institutionibus pravis circumscripta licet libidinibus ac concupiscentiis evigorata, licet falsis deis exancillata, cum tamen resipiscit ut ex crapula, ut ex somno, ut ex aliqua valetudine, et sanitatem suam potitur, Deum nominat, hoc solo nomine, quia proprio Dei veri. Deus magnus, Deus bonus, et: quod Deus dederit, omnium vox est; judicem quoque contestatur illum: Deus videt, et: Deo commendo, et: Deus mihi reddet. O testimonium animæ naturaliter christianæ; denique pronuntians hæc, non ad capitolium, sed ad cœlum respicit, novit enim sedem Dei vivi.—De testim. animæ c. 2: Si enim anima ejus divina aut a Deo data est, sine dubio datorem suum novit. Et si novit utique et timet, et tantum postremo adauctorem. An non timet, quem magis propitium velit quam iratum? Unde igitur naturalis timor animæ in Deum, si Deus non vult irasci? Quomodo timetur qui nescit offendi? Quid timetur nisi ira? Unde ira nisi ex animadversione? Unde animadversio nisi de judicio? Unde judicium nisi de potestate? Cujus potestas summa nisi Deus solus? Hinc ergo tibi anima de conscientia suppetit domi ac foris, nullo irridente vel prohibente, prædicare: Deus videt omnia, et: Deo commendo, et: Deus reddet, et: Deus inter nos judicabit et sqq. comp. *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 88, 89. *Justin, M.* also speaks of the innate idea of God, Apol. II. 6: Τὸ Θεὸς προσαγόρευμα οὐκ ὄνομά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πράγματος δυσεξηγήτου ἔμφυτος τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξα. Comp. Did. c. Tr.

c. 93.—*Clem. of Alex.* Coh. vi. 59: Πᾶσιν γὰρ ἀπαξαπλῶς ἀνθρώποις, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς περὶ λόγους ἐνδιατρίβουσιν (qui in studiis literarum versati sunt) ἐνέστακταί τις ἀπόῤῥοια θεϊκή. Οὗ δὴ χάριν καὶ ἄκοντες μὲν ὁμολογοῦμεν ἕνα τε εἶναι Θεὸν, ἀνώλεθρον καὶ ἀγέννητον· τοῦτον ἄνω που περὶ τὰ νῶτα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ καὶ οἰκείᾳ, περιωπῇ ὄντως ὄντα ἀεί. Comp. Strom. v. 12, p. 698: Θεοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἔμφασις ἑνὸς ἦν τοῦ παντοκράτορος παρὰ πᾶσι τοῖς εὐφρονοῦσι πάντοτε φυσική· καὶ τῆς ἀϊδίου κατὰ τὴν θείαν πρόνοιαν εὐεργεσίας ἀντελαμβάνοντο οἱ πλεῖστοι, οἱ καὶ μὴ τέλεον ἀπηρυθριακότες πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν.

(7) This is beautifully expressed by *Theophilus* ad Autolycum from the commencement: "If thou sayest, show me thy God, I answer show me first thy man, and I will show thee my God. Show me first, whether the eyes of thy soul see, and the ears of thy heart hear. For as the eyes of the body perceive earthly things, light and darkness, white and black, beauty and deformity, etc., so the ears of the heart, and the eyes of the soul can perceive divine things. God is seen by those who can see him, when they open the eyes of their soul. All men have eyes, but the eyes of some are blinded, that they cannot see the light of the sun. But the sun does not cease to shine, because they are blind, they must ascribe it to their blindness that they cannot see. This is thy case, O man! The eyes of thy soul are darkened by sin, even by thy sinful actions. Like a bright mirror, man must have a pure soul. If there be any rust on the mirror, man cannot see the reflection of his countenance in it: likewise if there be sin in man, he cannot see God. Therefore first examine thyself, whether thou be not an adulterer, fornicator, thief, robber, etc., for thy crimes prevent thee from perceiving God." Comp. Clem. of Alex. Pæd. iii. 1, p. 250: Ἑαυτὸν γάρ τις ἐὰν γνῴη, Θεὸν εἴσεται. Minuc. Fel. c. 32. Ubique non tantum nobis proximus, sed infusus est (Deus.) Non tantum sub illo agimus; sed et cum illo prope dixerim vivimus.

(8) *Theophil.* ad Autol. 5.: "When we see a vessel spreading her canvas, and majestically riding on the billows of the stormy sea, we conclude that she has a pilot on board; thus from the regular course of the planets, the rich variety of creatures, we infer the existence of the Creator." Clem. of Alex. (comp. note 4.) *Minuc. Fel.* c. 32: Immo ex hoc Deum credimus, quod eum sentire possumus, videre non possumus. In operibus enim ejus et in mundi omnibus motibus virtutem ejus semper præsentem adspicimus, quum tonat, fulgurat, fulminat, quum serenat, etc.

Comp. c. 18: Quod si ingressus aliquam domum omnia exculta, disposita, ornata vidisses, utique præesse ei crederes dominum, et illis bonis rebus multo esse meliorem: ita in hac mundi domo, quum cœlum terramque perspicias, providentiam, ordinem, legem, crede esse universitatis dominum parentemque, ipsis sideribus et totius mundi partibus pulchriorem. Novat. ab init.

(9) *Clem of Alex.* Strom. v. 12, p. 695: Ναὶ μὴν ὁ δυσμεταχειριστότατος περὶ Θεοῦ λόγος οὗτός ἐστιν· ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἀρχὴ παντὸς πράγματος δυσεύρετος, πάντως που ἡ πρώτη καὶ πρεσβυτάτη ἀρχὴ δύσδεικτος, ἥτις καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν αἰτία τοῦ γενέσθαι κ. τ. λ. Ib. in calce et 696: Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐπιστήμη λαμβάνεται τῇ ἀποδεικτικῇ· αὕτη γὰρ ἐκ προτέρων καὶ γνωριμωτέρων συνίσταται· τοῦ δὲ ἀγεννήτου οὐδὲν προϋπάρχει· λείπεται δὴ θείᾳ χάριτι καὶ μόνῳ τῷ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγῳ τὸ ἄγνωστον νοεῖν. Strom. iv. 25, p. 635: Ὁ μὲν οὖν Θεὸς ἀναπόδεικτος ὢν, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιστημονικὸς· ὁ δὲ υἱὸς σοφία τε ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιστήμη κ. τ. λ. Likewise *Origen*, contra Cels. vii. 42. (Opp. T. 1. p. 725,) maintains in reference to the saying of Plato, that it is difficult to find God; Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀποφαινόμεθα, ὅτι οὐκ αὐτάρκης ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις ὁπωσποτανοῦν ζητῆσαι τὸν θεὸν, καὶ εὑρεῖν αὐτὸν καθαρῶς, μὴ βοηθηθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ ζητουμένου· εὑρισκομένου τοῖς ὁμολογοῦσι μετὰ τὸ παρ' αὐτοὺς ποιεῖν, ὅτι δέονται αὐτοῦ, ἐμφανίζοντος ἑαυτὸν οἷς ἂν κρίνῃ εὔλογον εἶναι ὀφθῆναι, ὡς πέφυκε θεὸς μὲν ἀνθρώπῳ γινώσκεσθαι, ἀνθρώπου δὲ ψυχὴ ἔτι οὖσα ἐν σώματι γιγνώσκειν τὸν θεόν.

§ 36.

THE UNITY OF GOD.

Since Christianity adopted the doctrine of One God as taught in the Old Testament, it became necessary that it should defend it not only against the polytheism of heathen nations, but also against the Gnostic doctrine of two supreme beings (dualism,) and the theory of emanation.(1) Regarding the dualistic notions of the Gnostics, we may remark that they were evidently borrowed from paganism. Some proved the necessity of the unity of God,(2) though not in the ablest manner, from the relations of space,(3) or even from analogies in the rational and irrational creations.(4) The more profound thinkers, however, were well aware, that it is not sufficient to demonstrate the mere numerical unity of the Divine Being, and accordingly placed the transcendental unity far above the mathematical monas.(5)

---

(1) Both the hypothesis of the existence of a *δημιουργός, ἄρχων* Jaldabaoth, etc. who is subordinate to the Supreme God (*θεὸς ἀκατονόμαστος, βυθός*), and the dividing of the One God into numerous æons, are contrary to monotheism. On the more fully developed systems of Basilides and Valentinus, comp. Irenæus, Clem of Alexandria, and the works quoted § 23.

(2) *Justin, M.* simply acknowledges this necessity, by considering the unity of God an innate idea, which was not lost till afterwards. In his opinion monotheism is the first true criterion of religious principles, Coh. ad Græc. c. 36: *Δυνατὸν μανθάνειν ὑμᾶς ἕνα καὶ μόνον εἶναι θεὸν, ὃ πρῶτόν ἐστι τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεοσεβείας γνώρισμα.*

(3) To this class belongs the proof adduced by *Athenagoras* legat. pro Christianis, c. 8: " If there had been two or three gods from the commencement, they would either be at one and the same place, or each would occupy a separate space. They cannot exist at one and the same place, for if they be gods, they cannot be equal (accordingly they must exclude each other.) Only the created is equal to its pattern, but not the uncreated, for it does not proceed from anything, neither is it formed after any model. But as the hand, the eye, and the foot are different members of *one* body, as they conjointly compose that body, so God is but one God. Socrates is a compound being, as he is made, and subject to change; but God, who is uncreated, and can neither be divided, nor acted upon by another being, cannot consist of parts. But if each god were supposed to occupy a separate space, what place could we assign to the other god, or the other gods, seeing that God is *above* the world, and *round about* all things? For as the world is round, and God surrounds all beings, where would yet be room for any of the other gods? For such a god cannot be *in* the world, because it belongs to another; no more can he surround the world, for the Creator of the world, even God, surrounds it. But if he can be neither *in* the world, nor *around* it (for the *true* God occupies the whole space around it) where can he be? Perhaps above the world, and above God? *in* another world? or *around* another world? But if he exists *in* another world, and *around* another world, he does not exist for us, and does not govern our world, and his power, therefore, is not very great, for then he is confined with-

in certain boundaries. But as he exists neither *in* another world (for God himself fills the whole universe); nor *around* another world (for God surrounds the universe), it follows that he does not exist at all, since there is nothing in which he could exist."

(4) *Minuc. Fel.* c. 18: Quando unquam regni societas aut cum fide cœpit, aut sine cruore desiit? Omitto Persas de equorum hinnitu augurantes principatum, et Thebanorum præmortuam fabulam transeo; ob pastorum et casæ regnum de geminis memoria notissima est; generi et soceri bella toto orbe diffusa sunt, et tam magni imperi duos fortuna non cepit. Vide cetera: rex unus apibus, dux unus in gregibus, in armentis rector unus. Tu in cœlo summam potestatem dividi credas, et scindi veri illius ac divini imperii potestatem? quum palam sit, parentem omnium Deum nec principium habere nec terminum, etc. Comp. *Cyprian* de idolorum vanitate, p. 14.

(5) *Clem.* Pæd. i. 8. p. 140: Ἓν δὲ ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ ἑνὸς καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὴν μονάδα. Along with the idea of the *unity* of God, *Origen* speaks of the more metaphysical idea of his *simplicity*, de princ. i. 1. 6. Opp. T. i. p. 51: Non ergo aut corpus aliquid, aut, *in* corpore esse putandus est Deus, sed intellectualis natura simplex, nihil omnino adjunctionis admittens, uti ne majus aliquid et inferius in se habere credatur, sed ut sit, et omni parte μονάς et ut ita dicam ἑνάς, et mens et fons, ex quo initium totius intellectualis naturæ vel mentis est. [Comp. also *Bennett*, l. c. p. 111–116.]

§ 37.

GOD AS A BEING WHICH MAY BE COMPREHENDED, KNOWN, AND NAMED.

The idea of a *revealed* religion implied that so much of the nature of God should be made *manifest* to man, as would be necessary to the knowledge of salvation; the church, therefore, has always cultivated the λόγος περὶ Θεοῦ (theology.) On the other hand, the insufficiency of human ideas was acknowledged (in opposition to the pride of speculation), and the character of the Divine Being admitted to be past finding out; some even entertained doubts about the propriety of giving

God any name. Much of what the church designated by the term *mystery* (sacrament), is founded partly on a sense of the insufficiency of our ideas, and the inaptitude of our language, and partly on the necessity of employing certain ideas and expressions, to communicate our religious thoughts and opinions.

When the martyr Attalus, in the persecution of the Gallican Christians under Marcus Aurelius, was asked by his judges, what the name of God was, he replied : ὁ θεὸς ὄνομα οὐκ ἔχει ὡς ἄνθρωπος, Euseb. v. 1, (edit. *Heinichen*, t. ii. p. 29, comp. the note.) Such was also the opinion of *Justin M.*, Apology, ii. 6 ; whatever name may be given to God, he who has given a name to a thing, must always be anterior to it. He therefore draws a distinction between *appellatives* (προσρήσεις) and *names* (ὀνόματα.) The predicates πατὴρ, θεὸς, κύριος, δεσπότης, are only appellatives. Therefore he also calls God ἄῤῥητος πατὴρ ; other passages are given by *Semisch*, ii. p. 252, ss. God is not only above all *names*, but also above all *existence*, (ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας), comp. dial. cum Tryph. c. 3, in reference to Plato. But elsewhere he speaks of the οὐσία of God, *e. g.* dial. c. Tryph. c. 128, and even ascribes to him (in a certain sense) a kind of μορφή. Apol. i. 9 ; comp. *Semisch*, ii. p. 252. *Theoph ad Autol.* i. 3 : Ἄκουε, ὦ ἄνθρωπε, τὸ μὲν εἶδος τοῦ θεοῦ, ἄῤῥητον καὶ ἀνέκφραστον, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον ὀφθαλμοῖς σαρκίνοις ὁραθῆναι· δόξῃ γάρ ἐστιν ἀχώρητος, μεγέθει ἀκατάληπτος, ὕψει ἀπερινόητος, ἰσχύϊ ἀσύγκριτος, σοφίᾳ ἀσυμβίβαστος, ἀγαθοσύνῃ ἀμίμητος, καλοποιΐᾳ ἀνεκδιήγητος· εἰ γὰρ φῶς αὐτὸν εἴπω, ποίημα αὐτοῦ λέγω· εἰ λόγον εἴπω, ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ λέγω (comp. the note to this passage by Maran)· νοῦν ἐὰν εἴπω, φρόνησιν αὐτοῦ λέγω· πνεῦμα ἐὰν εἴπω, ἀναπνοὴν αὐτοῦ λεγω· σοφίαν ἐὰν εἴπω, γέννημα αὐτοῦ λέγω· ἰσχὺν ἐὰν εἴπω, κράτος αὐτοῦ λέγω· πρόνοιαν ἐὰν εἴπω, ἀγαθοσύνην αὐτοῦ λέγω· βασιλείαν ἐαν εἴπω, δοξαν αὐτοῦ λέγω· κύριον ἐαν εἴπω, κριτὴν αὐτὸν λέγω· κριτὴν ἐὰν εἴπω, δίκαιον αὐτὸν γέλω· πατέρα ἐὰν εἴπω, τὰ πάντα αὐτὸν λέγω· πυρ ἐὰν εἴπω, τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτοῦ λέγω κ. τ. λ. Comp. i. 5 : Εἰ γὰρ τῳ ἡλίῳ ἐλαχίστῳ ὄντι στοιχείῳ οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος ἀτενίσαι διὰ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν θέρμην καὶ δύναμιν, πῶς οὐχὶ μᾶλλον τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δόξῃ ἀνεκφράστῳ οὔσῃ ἄνθρωπος θνητὸς οὐ δύναται ἀντωπῆσαι. According to *Iren.* ii. 25. 4. God is indeterminabilis, nor can any one fully comprehend his nature by thinking. *Minuc. Fel.* c. 18 : Hic (Deus) nec videri potest, visu clarior est, nec comprehendi, tactu purior est, nec æstimari, sensibus major est, infinitus, immensus et soli sibi tantus quantus est notus ; nobis vero ad intellectum pectus angustum est, et ideo sic eum digne æstimamus, dum inæstimabilem dicimus. Eloquar, quemadmodum sentio: magnitudinem Dei, que se putat nosse, minuit, qui non vult minuere, non novit. Nec nomen Deo quæras: DEUS nomen est! Illic vocabulis opus est, quum per singulos propriis appellationum insignibus multitudo dirimenda est. Deo, qui solus est, Dei vocabulum totum est. Quem si patrem dixero, terrenum opineris; si regem, carnalem suspiceris; si dominum, intelliges utique mortalem. Aufer additamenta nominum, et perspicies ejus claritatem. *Clement of Alexandria* shows very distinctly, Strom. vii. p. 689, that we can attain to a clear perception of God only by laying aside δι' ἀναλύσεως all finite ideas of the Divine nature, till at last nothing but the abstract idea of unity remains. But lest we should content ourselves with the mere negation, we must throw ourselves (ἀποῤῥίψωμεν ἑαυτοὺς) into the greatness of Christ, in whom the glory of God was manifest, in order to obtain thus in some way or other (ἀμηγέπῃ) the knowledge of God, (*i. e.* in a practico-religious manner, not by speculation); for even then we learn only what God is *not*, not *what* he is, (that is to say, if we speak of absolute, perfect knowledge.) Comp. also the 12th and 13th chapters of the 5th book from p. 692; in particular p. 695, and c. 1, p. 647: Δῆλον γὰρ μηδένα δύνασθαι παρὰ τὸν τῆς ζωῆς χρόνον τὸν θεὸν ἐναργῶς καταλαβέσθαι, he therefore gives the advice, ibid. p. 651: Τὸ δὲ ἄρα ζητεῖν περὶ θεοῦ ἂν μὴ εἰς ἔριν, ἀλλὰ εἰς εὕρεσιν τείνῃ, σωτήριόν ἐστι. *Origen* contra Celsum, vi. 65. Opp. T. i. p. 681, and de princ. i. 1. 5. p. 50: Dicimus secundum veritatem, Deum incomprehensibilem esse atque inæstimabilem. Si quid enim illud est, quod sentire vel intelligere de Deo potuerimus, multis longe modis eum meliorem esse ab eo quod sensimus necesse est credere. "As much as the brightness of the sun exceeds the dim light of a lantern, so much the glory of God surpasses our idea of it." Likewise *Novatian* says, de trinit. c. 2: De hoc ergo ac de eis quæ sunt ipsius, et in eo sunt, nec mens hominis quæ sint, quanta sint et qualia sint, digne concipere potest, nec eloquentia sermonis humani æquabilem majestati ejus virtutem sermonis expromit. Ad cogitandam enim et ad eloquendam illius majestatem et eloquentia omnis merito muta est et mens omnis exigua est: major est enim mente ipsa, nec cogitari possit quantus sit: ne si potuerit cogitari, mente humana minor sit, qua concipi possit Major est quoque omni sermone, nec edici possit: ne si potuerit edici, humana sermone minor sit, quo quum edicitur, et circumiri et colligi possit. Quidquid enim de illo cogitatum fuerit, minus ipso erit, et quidquid enunciatum fuerit, minus illo comparatum circum ipsum erit. Sentire enim illum taciti aliquatenus possumus, ut autem ipse est, sermone explicare non possumus. Sive enim illum dixeris lucem, creaturam ipsius magis quam ipsum dixeris, etc....Quidquid omnino de illo retuleris, rem aliquam ipsius magis et virtutem quam ipsum explicaveris. Quid enim de eo condigne aut dicas aut sentias, qui omnibus et sermonibus major est? etc. This Christian scholasticism which pervades the first period, forms a striking contrast with the modern confidence of old and new scholastic mode and style! Nevertheless the Fathers (and Origen in particular) also admit a spiritual perception of God, which is now brought about by the medium of Christ, but will at length be immediate.

§ 38.

IDEALISM AND ANTHROPOMORPHISM.—CORPOREITY OF GOD.

The educated mind, desirous of removing from the nature of God as much as possible every thing that could remind man of the finite or compound, sometimes takes offence even at the idea of the substantiality of God, from fear of reducing him to the level of created beings. At the same time, it is possible so to refine our conceptions of the Deity, as to resolve it into a mere abstract negation. In opposition to this idealizing tendency, pious souls at an early period manifested the desire of possessing a real God *for* the world, *for* man, and *for* the human heart; and the bold and figurative language which they employed, as well as the symbolical and anthropomorphitic expressions which they applied to the Divine Being, amply compensated for what the idea of God had lost in the way of negation. Both these tendencies, which claim alike the consideration of thinking men, and have engaged the attention of philosophers in all ages,(1) have their respective representatives in the first period of the history of doctrines. On the one hand, the Alexandrian school, and *Origen* in particular, endeavoured to remove from God every thing that could give rise to carnal ideas concerning his nature.(2) On the other hand, *Tertullian* insisted so much on the idea of the substantiality of God, that he confounded it with his corporeity, though it must be admitted that he did not ascribe to him a gross, material body like that of man.(3)

---

(1) On this subject even the ancient philosophers entertained different opinions. The popular, polytheistic form of religion was founded on anthropomorphism. Xenophanes of Colophon, the founder of the Eleatic school, endeavoured to combat polytheism as well as anthropomorphism. Comp. *Clem. Alex.* Strom. v. 14, p. 714:

> Εἷς θεὸς ἔν τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισι μέγιστος,
> Οὔ τι δέμας θνητοῖσιν ὁμοίιος οὐδὲ νόημα, κ. τ. λ.

and Strom. vii. 4, p. 841, and the other passages in *Preller*, hist. phil. græco-rom. Hamb. 1838. *Ritter*, i. p. 450. [English translat. by *Morrison*, i. p. 430.] *Schleiermacher*, p. 60. The Epicureans (though it is doubtful whether Epicurus himself seriously meant to teach this doctrine) imagined that the gods possessed a quasi human form, but without the wants of men, and were unconcerned about their sufferings and pleasures. Thus they retained only what is vain in anthropomorphism, and lost sight of its more profound signification (the human relation of God to man.) Comp. Cic. de Natura Deorum, i. 8—21. *Reinhold*, i. p. 267, note. *Ritter*, iii. 490. [Engl. transl. iii. 442.]—Different views were adopted by the Stoics, who represented God as the vital force and reason which govern the universe; but though they avoided anthropomorphitic notions, they regarded him as clothed in an etherial robe. Cic. de Nat. D. ii. 24. *Ritter*, iii. p. 576. [English translation, iii. p. 520, ss.]

(2) *Clement* opposes anthropomorphism in different places: "Most men talk and judge of God from their own limited point of view, as if cockles and oysters were to reason out of their narrow shells, and the hedgehog out of his own self." Strom. v. 11, p. 687, comp. vii. 5, p. 845, c. 7, p. 852, 53: "Ὅλος ἀκοὴ καὶ ὅλος ὀφθαλμὸς, ἵνα τις τούτοις χρήσηται τοῖς ὀνόμασιν, ὁ Θεός. Καθ' ὅλου τοίνυν οὐδεμίαν σώζει θεοσέβειαν, οὔτε ἐν ὕμνοις οὔτε ἐν λόγοις, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν γραφαῖς ἢ δόγμασιν ἡ μὴ πρέπουσα περὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπόληψις, ἀλλ' εἰς ταπεινὰς καὶ ἀσχήμονας ἐκτρεπομένη ἐννοίας τε καὶ ὑπονοίας· ὅθεν ἡ τῶν πολλῶν εὐφημία

δυσφημίας οὐδὲν διαφέρει διὰ τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἄγνοιαν κ. τ. λ, (on prayer.) *Origen* begins his work περὶ ἀρχῶν immediately after the Procem. with objections to anthropomorphitic or material ideas of God: " I know that many appeal even to Scripture in proof of their assertion that God is a corporeal being; because they find in the writings of Moses that he is called a consuming fire, and read in the gospel of John that he is a Spirit (πνεῦμα.) They cannot think of fire and spirit but as something corporeal. I should like to ask these persons what they say of the passage in 1 John i. 5: " God is light?" He is a light to enlighten those who seek the truth. (Ps. xxxvi. 9); for " the light of God" is nothing more than his Divine power, by means of which he who is enlightened perceives truth in all things, and apprehends God himself as the truth. In this sense we must understand the phrase; in thy light we shall see light, *i e.* in the Logos, in the wisdom which is thy Son, we see thee, the Father. Is it then necessary to suppose that God resembles the sun-light, because he is called *light?* Can any sensible meaning be attached to the idea, that knowledge and wisdom have their source in " corporeal light?" But the spiritualizing tendency of Origen led him frequently so to explain even the more profound sayings of Scripture, as to leave nothing but a mere abstract idea. *Novatian* also expresses himself in very strong and decided terms against anthropomorphism; de trin. c. 6: Non intra hæc nostri corporis lineamenta modum aut figuram divinæ majestatis includimus . . . . Ipse totus oculus, quia totus videt, totus auris, quia totus audit. Even the definition, that God is a spirit, has, according to him, only a relative validity: Illud quod dicit Dominus (John iv.) spiritum Deum, puto ego sic locutum Christum de patre, ut adhuc aliquid plus intelligi velit quam spiritum Deum. He thinks that this is only figurative language, as it is said elsewhere, God is light, etc. omnis enim spiritus creatura est.

(3) The first Christian writer who is said to have ascribed a body to the Deity, is *Melito of Sardis* in his treatise περὶ ἐνσωμάτου θεοῦ, which is no longer extant, comp. Orig. comment. in Genes. Opp. T. ii. p. 25. Euseb. iv. 26, and *Heinichen* on that passage. Gennad. de dogm. eccles. c. 4. and *Piper*, über Melito, in the theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1838, i. p. 71, where a similar view is cited from the Clementine Homilies. [*Burton, E.*, Testimonies of the Anti-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ,

etc. (Works, ii.) p. 64.] It is more certain that *Tertullian* ascribed to God (and so also to the soul) a body which he did not however represent as a human body, but as the necessary form of all existence, (comp. *Schleiermacher,* Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 165), de Carne Christi, c. 11: Ne esse quidem potest, nisi habens per quod sit. Cum autem (anima) sit, habeat necesse est aliquid per quod sit. Si habet aliquid, per quod est, hoc erit corpus ejus. Omne quod est, corpus est sui generis. Nihil est incorporale, nisi quod non est. Advers. Praxeam, c. 7: Quis enim negabit Deum corpus esse, etsi Deus spiritus est? Spiritus enim corpus sui generis in sua effigie. Sed et invisibilia illa quæcunque sunt, habent apud Deum et suum corpus et suam formam, per quæ soli Deo visibilia sunt; quanto magis quod ex ipsius substantia missum est, sine substantia non erit. Comp. *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 451. But Tertullian himself draws a definite distinction, which excludes all grosser forms of anthropomorphism, between the Divine and the human corpus, advers. Marc. ii. 16: Discerne substantias et suos eis distribue sensus, tam diversos, quam substantiæ exigunt, licet vocabulis communicare videantur. Nam et dexteram et oculos et pedes Dei legimus, nec ideo tamen humanis comparabuntur, quia de appellatione sociantur. Quanta erit diversitas divini corporis et humani, sub eisdem nominibus membrorum, tanta erit et animi divini et humani differentia, sub eisdem licet vocabulis sensuum, quos tam corruptorios efficit in homine corruptibilitas substantiæ humanæ, quam incorruptorios in Deo efficit incorruptibilitas substantiæ divinæ.[a] On the anthropomorphism

---

[a] *Münscher*, ed. by Cölln, i. p. 134, adduces this passage to show that Tertullian is justly chargeable with real anthropomorphism. It rather proves the contrary. It must also be borne in mind that the corporeity of God and anthropomorphism are by no means synonymous terms. It is possible to represent God by way of anthropomorphism as a Spirit of very limited expanse, and bearing resemblance to the spirit of man, without ascribing to him a body. On the other hand, the substantiality of God may be taken in so abstract a manner, as not to confound it with humanity and personality, (so the Stoics.) Tertullian combines both these modes of representation, but after all that has been said, it is the awkwardness of his style rather than his manner of thinking, that has brought him into disrepute. [This may be clearly seen from the following passage: "Divine affections are ascribed to the Deity by means of figures borrowed from the human form, not as if he were indued with corporeal qualities: when eyes are ascribed to him, it denotes that he sees all things; when ears, that he hears all things; the speech de-

of Cyprian, see Rettberg, p. 300. *Irenæus* rejects both anthropomorphism properly so called, and false anthropopathism. In no respect God is to be compared to human frailty; though his *love* justifies us in using human phraseology when speaking of him, nevertheless we feel that, as to his *greatness*, and his true nature, he is elevated above all that is human; comp adv. hær. ii. 13, 4., and iv. 20. iv. 5. *Duncker*, l. c. p. 27. *Baur*, Christ. Gnosis, p. 466.

§ 39.

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

Neither the existence of God, as we have already seen, nor his attributes, were from the first defined with scientific precision. The Catholic church simply adopted the concrete idea of a personal God as propounded in the Old Test., though in a somewhat modified form.(1) But as in course of time metaphysical ideas were borrowed from the schools of philosophers, and transferred to the God of the Christians, it is not difficult to perceive how the views entertained on this subject by different writers would be more or less influenced by the different tendencies of these schools. Some connected their notions of the *omnipresence* of God with their conceptions of his corporeity, which fills the universe and displaces all other bodies;(2) others maintained that he was exalted above space, or that, having destroyed space, he put himself in its room.(3) The doctrine of *omniscience* was to some extent mixed up with anthropomorphitic ideas, and

---

notes the will; nostrils, the perception of prayer; hands, creation; arms, power; feet, immensity; for he has no members, and performs no office for which they are required, but executes all things by the sole act of his will. How can he require eyes, who is light itself? or feet, who is omnipresent? How can he require hands, who is the silent creator of all things? or a tongue, to whom to think is to command? Those members are necessary to men, but not to God, inasmuch as the counsels of men would be inefficacious unless his thoughts put his members in motion; but not to God, whose operations follow his will without effort." Comp. *Wright*, *W.*, in *Kitto*, Cyclop. of Bibl. Literat. art. Anthropomorphism.]

Origen himself limited this attribute of God,(4) as well as that of his *omnipotence*.(5) According to the spirit of Christianity, particular mention was made of the *love* and *mercy* of God, along with his *justice*.(6) But it was to be expected that at times difficulties would arise respecting apparent contradictions which could be removed only by the taking of more comprehensive and elevated views. Thus it became possible to reconcile, on the one side, the omniscience (especially the foreknowledge) of God with his omnipotence and goodness,(7) and, on the other side, his justice with his love and mercy.(8)

(1) The Catholic church preserved a right medium between the antijudaizing tendency of the Gnostics, who spoke of the demiurgus as a being that was either subordinate to the Supreme God, or stood in a hostile relation to him; and the judaizing tendency of the Ebionites, who, retaining the rigid system of Judaism, mistook the universal design of the Christian doctrine of God. But here, as elsewhere, we observe a wide difference between the theological opinions of the North-African and those of the Alexandrian school.

(2) Comp. (§ 36. note 2.) the passage cited from Athenagoras on the unity of God. *Cyprian*, de idol. vanit. p. 15, finds fault with the heathen because they attempt to confine the infinite God within the narrow walls of a temple, whilst he ubique totus diffusus est. This expression would lead us to suppose that in his view the Deity was a kind of substance which fills space.

(3) *Philo* had previously identified God with absolute space, and taught that he alone can set bounds to his own existence; comp. the passages bearing on this subject in the work of *Dähne*, p. 281—284, and p. 193, 267, ss.; *Theophilus* ad Autol. ii. 3, also calls God his own space (αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ τόπος ἐστίν.) He justly confines the omnipresence of God not to his mere *existence* at every place at one and the same time, but considers it as his uninterrupted activity which is known from his works, comp. i. 5. *Clem. of Alex.* denies that the relations of space can be applied to God, Strom. ii. 2, p. 431: Οὐ γὰρ ἐν γνόφῳ ἢ τόπῳ ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλ' ὑπεράνω καὶ τόπου καὶ χρόνου καὶ τῆς τῶν γεγονότων ἰδιότητος· διὸ οὐδὲ ἐν μέρει καταγίνεταί ποτε, οὔτε περιέχων οὔτε περιεχόμενος ἢ κατὰ ὁρισμόν τινα ἢ κατὰ ἀποτομήν.—According to *Origen* God sustains and fills the world

(which he thought to be an animate being) with his power, but he neither fills the universe with his presence, nor does he even move in it, comp. de princ. ii. 1. Opp. i. p. 77. For an explanation of popular and figurative expressions which represent the Deity as occupying space, and convey the idea of a change of place, vide contra Cels. iv. 5. Opp. i. p. 505, and comp. also p. 686. Concerning the expression that God may be all in all, see de princ. iii. 6. Opp. i. p. 152, 153.

(4) De princ. iii. 2. Opp. i. p. 49. *Origen* proves that the world is finite, because God could not comprehend it, if it were infinite; for that only may be understood which has a beginning. But it were impious to say, that there is any thing which God does not comprehend. Comp. with this the much simpler view of *Clement* Strom. vi. 17, p. 821: Ὁ γάρ τοι Θεὸς πάντα οἶδεν, οὐ μόνον τὰ ὄντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐσόμενα καὶ ὡς ἔσται ἕκαστον· τάς τε ἐπὶ μέρους κινήσεις προορῶν πάντ᾽ ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντ᾽ ἐπακούει, γυμνὴν ἔσωθεν τὴν ψυχὴν βλέπων, καὶ τὴν ἐπίνοιαν τὴν ἑκάστου τῆς κατὰ μέρος ἔχει δι᾽ αἰῶνος· καὶ ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῶν θεάτρων γίνεται, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἑκάστου μερῶν, κατὰ τὴν ἐνόρασίν τε καὶ περιόρασιν καὶ συνόρασιν, τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ γίνεται. Ἀθρόως τε γὰρ πάντα καὶ ἕκαστον ἐν μέρει μιᾷ προσβολῇ προσβλέπει. *Just. M.* dial. c. Tryph. c. 127: Ὁ γὰρ ἄῤῥητος πατὴρ καὶ κύριος τῶν πάντων οὔτε ποι ἀφῖκται, οὔτε περιπατεῖ, οὔτε καθεύδει, οὔτε ἀνίσταται, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ χώρᾳ ὅπου ποτὲ μένει. ὀξὺ ὁρῶν καὶ ὀξὺ ἀκούων, οὐκ ὀφθαλμοῖς οὐδὲ ὠσίν, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει ἀλέκτῳ· καὶ πάντα ἐφορᾷ καὶ πάντα γίνωσκει, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἡμῶν λέληθεν αὐτόν.

(5) Origen de princ. ii. c. 9. p. 97: Ἐν τῇ ἐπινοουμένῃ ἀρχῇ τοσοῦτον ἀριθμὸν τῷ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ ὑποστῆσαι τὸν θεὸν νοερῶν, οὐσιῶν, ὅσον ἠδύνατο διαρκέσαι· πεπερασμένην γὰρ εἶναι καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ λεκτέον κ. τ. λ. But in other places Origen expresses himself in a very appropriate and dignified manner concerning the Divine omnipotence; contra Cels. v. Opp. i. p. 595, he shows that God can do all things, but does nothing which is contrary to nature (παρὰ φύσιν,) οὔτε τὰ ἀπὸ κακίας, οὔτε τὰ ἀλόγως γενόμενα.

(6) The idea of Clement of Alexandria is worthy of notice, which was evidently borrowed from the Gnostic doctrine of an ἀῤῥενόθηλυς; he thinks that the compassion of God presents the female aspect of his character, quis div. salv. p. 956, and finds something analogous in the Old Test., Is. xlix. 15. Comp. *Neander's* gnostische Systeme, p. 209. The works of Clement, in particular, abound with passages referring to the love and mercy of God. He loves men on account of the relations in which they stand to their creator, Coh. p. 89: Πρόκειται δὲ ἀεὶ τῷ Θεῷ τὴν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλην σώζειν. Comp. Strom. vii. p. 832. Coh. 74. Pæd. I. p. 102.

(7) Origenes contra Cels. ii. Opp. i. p. 405. Comment. in Gen. Opp. ii. p. 10, 11. For more particulars comp. the doctrine of human liberty, § 57.

(8) Another point of distinction between the Gnostics and orthodox Christians was, that the former did not know how to reconcile the equity of God which inflicts punishment, with that other attribute which passes by transgressions, and redeems from sin; on this account they thought themselves compelled to separate the just God of the Old Test. from the loving Father of the Christians (so Marcion.) In opposition to this ill-founded distinction, Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, etc. insist particularly on the penal justice of God, and show that it can very well be reconciled with his love. According to *Irenæus*, adv. hær. v. 27. penalty does not consist in anything positive which comes from God, but in the separation of the sinner from God. God does not punish *προηγητικῶς*, but *ἐπακολουθούσης δι' ἐκείνης (τῆς ἁμαρτίας) τῆς κολάσεως*. *Tertullian*, on the contrary, considers the penal justice of God to be based on the legal principle of the inviolableness of the law, and distinguishes between true love and bevevolent weakness, comp. contra Marc. i. 25, 26. ii. 13. 14. 16. (negabimus Deum, in quo non omnia, quæ Deo digna sint, constent); in his opinion the anger of God depends on love itself. Accordingly, he draws a distinction between malis supplicii s. pœnæ and malis culpæ s. peccati. God is the author only of the former; the devil is the author of the latter. To defend himself against the charge of anthropomorphism he says: Stultissimi, qui de humanis divina præjudicant, ut quoniam in homine corruptoriæ conditionis habentur hujusmodi passiones, idcirco et in Deo ejusdem status existimentur, etc. *Clement* of Alexandria adopts partly the same view, Strom. iv. 24, p. 634; but in enumerating the causes which induce God to inflict penalties, he speaks of the legal principle as being the last. The principal design of the divine punishments seems to him, to make men better, and to warn and restrain others from the commission of sin. Comp. Pæd. i. 8. p. 40. This is distinctly set forth, Strom. vii. p. 895: *'Αλλ' ὡς πρὸς τοῦ διδασκάλου ἢ τοῦ πατρὸς οἱ παῖδες, οὕτως ἡμεῖς πρὸς τῆς προνοίας κολαζόμεθα. Θεὸς δὲ οὐ τιμωρεῖται· ἔστι γὰρ ἡ τιμωρία κακοῦ ἀνταπόδοσις· κολάζει μέν τοι πρὸς τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίᾳ τοῖς κολαζομένοις.* *Origen* refutes at great length the objections of the Gnostics, de princ. ii. 5. Opp. t. i. p. 102, by proving that their distinction between "benevolent," and

"just," is altogether untenable, and showing that the Divine penalties are inflicted by a kind father, and wise physician; at the same time he applies the allegorical interpretation to those passages of the Old Test. which speak by way of anthropomorphism of the wrath and vengeance of God; comp. also contra Cels. iv. 71, 72. p. 556. (comp. however § 48.)

§ 40.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LOGOS.

a. Traces of it in the Period before the Christian Era, and in Jewish and Gentile Systems of Religion and Philosophy.

**Lücke*, geschichtliche Erörterung der Logosidee in his Commentar über das Evangelium, Joh. i. vol. p. 205, ss. [*Tholuck*, Commentar zum Evang. Joh. ch. i. Die Logoslehre. 6th ed. p. 52, ss.] **Dorner*, Entwickelungsgeschichte der Christologie. Stuttg. 1839. p. 4-34. *Von Bohlen*, das alte Indien mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Aegypten. ii. Königsb. 1830. i. p. 201, ss. *Stuhr*, die Religionssyteme der heidnischen Völker des Orients, S. 99, ss. *Kleuker*, Zendavesta im Kleinen. vol. ii. p. 1, ss. **Bäumlein*, Versuch die Bedeuteung des johann. Logos aus den Religionssystemen des Orients zu entwickeln. [*Köstlin*, der Lehrbegriff des Evang. und der Briefe Joh. und die verwandten neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe. Berlin, 1843. *Burton, E.*, the Bampton Lecture on the Heresies of the Apostolic Age, Lect. vii. Comp. also *Pye Smith*, Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, 3d edit. i. 522-529. ii. 415. 432, et passim.] *F. Ch. Baur*, die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung Tüb. 1841-43, 3 vols. vol. I. p. 1-128. **G. A. Meier*, die Lehre von der Trinitat. Hamb. 1844. I. p. 1, ss.

The difficulty which men experienced in thinking of God as a being purely spiritual and exalted above every finite object, was considerably increased when they viewed him at the same time in the relation which he sustains to the finite creation. It became necessary, with the increasing culture of the human mind, to form the idea of a *medium* (organ) by which God creates and governs the world, and manifests himself in it. This medium was supposed, on the one side, to have its existence in the Divine nature itself, and to stand in a most intimate connection with it, and, on the other, to be somehow or other distinct from it. In order to ascertain the origin of this idea, we need not go either to oriental sources, the wisdom of India and the religion of Zend, (1) or to the occidental systems of philosophy, and that of Plato in particular.(2) We may trace it in the more definite and concrete form which at the time when the apocryphal writings were composed, was given to the personifications of the Divine word, and the Divine wisdom found in the Old Test.(3) It may be further traced in the doctrine of Philo concerning the Logos,(4) and in some other notions which were then current.(5) But all these were only so many scattered seeds which Christianity was designed to quicken and make fruitful.

(1) " *It is easy to see that the Christian idea cannot be explained by an appeal to the Indian religion.*" *Dorner*, p. 7. The Trimurti of the Indian religion may be represented in the following manner:

Brahma	Vishnoo	Seeva (Kala)
Sun (Light)	Water (Air ?)	Fire
Creator	Preserver (progressive developement)	Destroyer
Power	Wisdom	Justice
Past	Present	Future
Matter	Space	Time

Comp. *Von Bohlen* and *Stuhr*, l. c. Among the Egyptians we find the following corresponding with these deities,

Brahma = Phtha
Vishnoo = Kneph
Seeva = Neith

The word by which Brahma created the world, is Om (Oum), see *Von Bohlen*, i. p. 159, ss. 212. In the system of Zoroaster the word Honover is represented as that by which the world was created, and as the most immediate revelation of the god Ormuzd, see *Kleuker*, l. c. and *Stuhr*, i. p. 370, 371. [*Burton*, l. c. Lect. ii. p. 44-48.] " *Since, in the pagan systems of religion, the* *natural is most intimately blended with the Divine, the idea of a trias established in them is altogether different from the Christian doctrine of the Trinity; in the former the trias only denotes the various modes of existence, and is therefore most fully developed in those religions which occupy a very low position, but disappears when the said unity of the Divine with the natural is lost sight of."* *Meier*, l. c. p. 4.

(2) The relation in which Plato (especially in Timæus) imagined God to stand to the creating νοῦς, presents only a remote analogy; likewise the passage bearing on the λόγος from Epinomis, p. 986, which Euseb. Præp. evang. xi. 16. professes to quote from Epimenides, given by *De Wette*, biblische Dogmatik § 157. Comp. *Tennemann*, das platonische Philosophem vom göttlichen Verstande, in *Paulus*' Memorabilien, Stück i. and his System der platonischen Philosophie, vol. iii. p. 149, ss. 174, ss. *Böckh*, über die Bildung der Weltseele im Timæus des Plato (in Daub und Creuzer's Studien, vol iii. p. 1, ss. *Ritter*, Geschichte der Philosophie, II. p. 291, ss. 318, ss. [*Burton*, l. c. Lect. vii. and note 90 in particular.]

(3) The oldest form of revelation which we find in the Old Test. is the direct *Theophany*, which, however, was adapted only to the age of childhood. In later times God speaks to his people in general, or to individuals, sometimes by angels (especially the מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה), sometimes by human mediators (Moses and the prophets.) But the intercourse of God with the prophets is carried on by the medium of the word of the Lord, דְּבַר יְהוָה which descends upon them. This λόγος (ῥῆμα τοῦ ϑεοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου) is poetically personified in several places; Ps. cxlvii. 15; Is. lv. 11; in an inferior degree, Ps. xxxiii. 4; cxix. 89, 104, 105; Is. xl. 8; Jer. xxiii. 29; comp. Lücke, l. c. p. 215, 216. Like the word, so the wisdom of God (חָכְמָה, σοφία) is personified: Job xxviii. 12–28, and in very significant terms, Prov. ch. viii. and ix. On קָנָנִי (Prov. viii. 22,) and the signification of אָמוֹן (viii. 30.) comp. *Umbreit's* Comment. p. 102, 106; on the personification of wisdom in the apocryphal writings (Sir. i. 4, 24; Baruch iii. 15, ss. iv. 1; Wisdom, vi. 22, to ch. ix.) see Lücke, l. c. p. 221, ss., and *Bretschneider*, systematische Darstellung der Dogmatik der Apokryphen. Leipsig, 1805, p. 191, ss. The strongest example of personification is in the Book of Wisdom, so that it is

difficult to define exactly the distinction between personification and the hypostasis, properly so called, especially ch. vii. 22, ss. On the relation of this hypostasis to that of Philo, see Lücke, l. c.

(4) On the question whether *Philo* ascribed personality to the Logos, see *Dorner*, i. p. 21, ss.; while most writers reply in the affirmative, Dorner entertains the opposite opinion. Thus much is certain, that Philo makes a distinction between the ὂν as such, and the λόγος τοῦ ὄντος, who is superior to the δυνάμεις, λόγοι, and ἄγγελοι. This Logos he also calls δεύτερος θεός, or θεὸς, as such, without the article; υἱὸς πρεσβύτερος, υἱὸς μονογενὴς, πρωτόγονος,—εἰκών, σκιά, παράδειγμα, δόξα, σοφία, ἐπιστήμη τοῦ θεοῦ. According to Philo the Logos is the essence and seat of the ideal world (ἰδέα τῶν ἰδεῶν ὁ θεοῦ λόγος) As an artist first makes a model of that which he purposes to make, so God first created the world ideally, see de mundi opif. § 5, and the notes by *J. G. Müller* (Philo's Buch von der Weltschöpfung, Berl. 1841), p. 149, ss. In the same manner the Logos is the mediator by whom the revelations of God were brought about; the appearances of God were made possible through his instrumentality; he is called the παράκλητος, ἀρχιερεύς, ἱκέτης, πρεσβεύτης ὀπαδος τοῦ θεοῦ. He takes care of all that is good as ἀρχὴ καὶ πηγὴ καλῶν πράξεων. Philo was acquainted with the distinction between λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικίς, though he employed these terms only in reference to the manifestations of the Logos in a human form, de vita Moys. lib. iii. p. 672, c.: Ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ δ' ὁ μὲν (λόγος) ἐστὶν ἐνδιάθετος, ὁ δὲ προφορικὸς, καὶ ὁ μὲν οἷά τις πηγὴ, ὁ δὲ γεγωνὸς ἀπ' ἐκείνου ῥέων. But he represents the Divine Logos analogous to the human. In as much as the Logos is the Divine idea, all spiritual and sensuous existence derives its origin from him; as natural power he pervades the world, and fills it with his essence. That Philo frequently personifies the Logos, does not necessarily imply that he ascribes to him real personality. But the most recent researches (since *Dorner*) have shown that Philo, in some places indeed, advances the idea of a real hypostasis (Alleg. iii. 93; de somna, i. 584, 585; quis rer. div. hær. 509, and elsewhere, comp. *F. Keferstein*, Philo's Lehre von der göttlichen Mittelwesen, Lipz. 1846; also *Semisch*, Justin der M., p. 274. *Baur*, Dreieinigkeits Lehre, i. p. 59, ss. *Meier*, Trinitätslehre, i. p. 20, ss.

(5) Traces of the doctrine of the Logos are also found in the Samaritan theology, and in the writings of Onkelos and Jona-

than, comp. *Lücke*, l. c. p. 244. Concerning the Adam Kadmon of the Cabbalists vide *Bretschneider*, l. c. p. 233, 236. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 332. *De Wette*, biblische Dogmatik, § 157. [*Burton*, l. c. Lect ii. p. 51–55.]

§ 41.

b. The Christian Doctrine of the Logos, as represented in the Writings of John.

Christianity gave a new aspect to the doctrine of the Logos; formerly it had been a purely speculative question, now it gained a practico-religious significance.(1) The Evangelist John, in accordance with the spirit of the doctrine of Paul,(2) though differing from him in the use of certain expressions, applied the term *Logos* to the incarnation of the Deity in Christ. This Logos was no longer a mere abstract idea, but the realization of a great religious truth, being founded on a historical fact; in this manner it became the proper spring of all Christian theology.

(1) It is true that Philo himself made use of the idea of the Logos for practico-religious purposes, inasmuch as he accommodated it to the Jewish religion by connecting it with the previously existing notions concerning the Messiah. But this connection was nevertheless very loose, and the idea of the Messiah itself was altogether abstract, and not historically realized by the Jews. On the contrary, both the Christian idea of the Logos, and the notion of the Messiah, find their realization in the person of Jesus of Nazareth; the speculative character of the former is realized in his Divine nature, the rational aspect of the latter in his humanity, (ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.)

(2) Though the term λόγος does not occur in the writings of Paul in the sense in which it is understood by John, yet the idea of the Divine pre-existence of Christ is clearly expressed by him, especially Col. i. 15–17; ii. 9. Similar expressions are found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. i. 4, ss. (Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 47; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Rom. viii. 29.) Concerning the doc-

trine of the Trinity, as propounded in the N. Test, see *Meier*, l. c. p. 24, ss.

§ 42.

c. *The Theologumenon of the Church concerning the Logos to the Times of Origen.*

[*Burton, E.*, Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ, etc. (Works, ii.)]

But this practical aspect of the doctrine of the Logos was not long preserved in its original form and purity. Even among the earlier Christians speculative notions were mixed up with it, which owed their existence to the peculiar circumstances of the age, and were strengthened by the infusion of foreign elements. Those heretics who adhered more closely to Judaism (the Ebionites), no less than the Alogi, *Theodotus* and *Artemon,* abstained most from speculations of this nature, since they rejected the substance of the Christian gnosis, the doctrine of the Logos, by denying the divinity of Christ. The theory of the Logos was likewise abandoned by the other section of the Monarchians, *Praxeas*, *Noëtus*, and *Beryllus,* who did away with the distinction between God the Father and the Logos, without however denying that God is in Christ.(1) The Gnostics, on the contrary, connected the idea of the Logos with their fanciful doctrine of emanation and of æons, and leaving the only safe foundation of historical truth, lost themselves in mythological speculations.(2) Thus it became incumbent upon the Fathers to defend the speculative element in opposition to the former class of heretics, the historical in opposition to the latter, and to bring both these elements to bear upon the practico-religious interests of the church. *Justin,*(3) *Tatian,*(4) *Athenagoras,*(5) *Theophilus,*(6) *Clement of Alexandria,*(7) endeavoured to explain the existence of the Logos, and his relation to the Father, by the aid of figures and analogies, which they borrowed from the visible world and the nature of man. *Tertullian*,(8) found himself compelled to adopt similar modes of expression, but *Irenæus*, who was unfavourable to all gnosis, decidedly opposed them, and firmly adhered to the ecclesiastical doctrine of the Trinity, as the direct expression of Christian belief.(9)

(1) Compare § 23. note 1. § 25. notes 2. and 3. The orthodox church did not separate the idea of the Logos from that of the Messiah, but the doctrinal tendency of the Ebionites, as well as of the Gnostics, took a partial direction. The former, by adopting the idea of the Messiah alone, lost sight of the spiritual import of the doctrine of the Logos; the reverse was the case with the Gnostics, who held a mere idea without substance, a shadow without body.—Concerning *Artemon*, whose opinions rank him among the Monarchians, *Schleiermacher* (in his essay: über die sabellianische und athanasische Vorstellung) observes, that he appears to him to have retained the doctrine of the unity of God with more seriousness, and greater desire to promote the interests of religion, than the more frivolous *Theodotus;* vide Zeitschrift von Schleiermacher, de Wette and Lücke, iii. p. 303, 304. He there shows also the difference between this tendency, and that of Praxeas and Noëtus, already alluded to, § 25, note 4. Comp. also § 46, note 3. [*Burton*, l. c. Lect. viii. p. 247–249, and notes 100, 101.]

(2) Even if we look merely at numbers, we perceive a considerable difference between the catholic doctrine of the Logos, and the views entertained by the Gnostic sects. Before the doctrine of the Trinity was farther developed, the Logos was considered by the orthodox church to be the *only* hypostasis; the Gnostics imagined heaven to be inhabited by a multitude of æons. According to *Basilides* there were 365 heavens (οὐρανοί) the lowest of which is under the immediate superintendence of the ἄρχων, the God of the Jews, and the creator of the world. He assigned an intermediate position between the Supreme God and the Logos to the νοῦς, and taught that the Logos emanated from the latter. Further emanations of the νοῦς were the φρόνησις, σοφία, δύναμις, δικαιοσύνη and εἰρήνη, and these five æons, together with the other two, νοῦς and λόγος, in all seven, formed along

with the θεὸς ἄῤῥητος (ἀνωνόμαστος) the first ὀγδοάς.—Still more ingenious is the system of *Valentinus*. [He asserted that from the great first cause (primitive existence, βυθός, προπάτωρ, προαρχή) successively emanated male and female æons (νοῦς or μονογενής and ἀλήθεια, λόγος and ζωή, ἄνθρωπος and ἐκκλησία, etc.) so that 30 æons (divided into the ὀγδοάς, δεκάς and δωδεκάς) form the πλήρωμα. The vehement desire of the last of the æons, the σοφία, to unite herself with the βυθός, gave existence to an immature being (ἡ κάτω σοφία, ἐνθύμησις, ἀχαμώθ) which, wandering outside the pleroma, imparted life to matter, and formed the δημιουργός who afterwards created the world. In order to restore the harmony of the pleroma, the two new æons, Χριστός and τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον were made; and last of all Ἰησοῦς (σωτήρ) emanated from all the æons, and as the future σύζυγος of the achamoth was appointed to lead back into the pleroma alike the æons, and all spiritual natures.] (Comp. *Neander*, *Matter*, and *Baur*, in the works mentioned § 23.) [*Gieseler*, Lehrbuch der Kircheng. § i. 45. *Burton*, l. c. Lect. ii. p. 36—41. *Norton*, Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. iii. note B. On Basilides and the Basilideans, p. xxxviii—xlix.]

(3) *Justin* follows Philo to a great extent, with this difference only, that he identifies the Logos by whom God has created the world, and manifested himself, with his incarnate Son, even Christ Jesus. Comp. Apol. ii. 6; Ὁ δὲ υἱὸς ἐκείνου (Θεοῦ), ὁ μόνος λεγόμενος κυρίως υἱὸς, ὁ λόγος πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων, καὶ συνὼν καὶ γεννώμενος, ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν δι' αὐτοῦ πάντα ἔκτισε καὶ ἐκόσμησε· Χριστὸς μὲν κατὰ τὸ κεχρῖσθαι καὶ κοσμῆσαι τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ τὸν Θεὸν, λέγεται· ὄνομα καὶ αὐτὸ περιέχον ἄγνωστον σημασίαν· ὃν τρόπον καὶ τὸ Θεὸς προσαγόρευμα οὐκ ὄνομά ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πράγματος δυσεξηγήτου ἔμφυτος τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων δόξα. Ἰησοῦς δὲ καὶ ἀνθρώπου καὶ σωτῆρος ὄνομα καὶ σημασίαν ἔχει, he then proceeds to the incarnation itself. Justin represents the generation of the Logos as προέρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, as γεννᾶσθαι, προβάλλεσθαι, and adduces several illustrations in support of his views. Thus man utters words without sustaining any loss; fire kindles fire without undergoing any diminution, etc. (The addition ἀλλ' οὐ τοιοῦτον is not genuine, see the note in the edit. of Maran: Si quis tamen retineat hæc verba, scribenda sunt cum interrogationis nota, ut in edit. Lond.) On the other hand, he rejects (dial. c. Tryph. 128.) the illustration taken from the sun and its beams; we can neither speak of an ἀποτέμνεσθαι, nor of an ἐκτείνεσθαι; see *Dorner*, ii. 1. p. 428.

(4) *Tatian* contra Græc. c. 5, uses illustrations similar to those of Justin. The Logos was imminent (ὑπέστησε) in the Father, but derived his existence (προπηδᾷ) from his will, and became thus ἔργον πρωτότοκον of the Father, ἀρχὴ τοῦ κόσμου. He is begotten κατὰ μερισμόν, not κατ' ἀποκοπήν.

(5) *Athen.* Leg. c. 10. calls the Son of God (in opposition to the sons of the heathen gods) λόγος τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν ἰδέᾳ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ· πρὸς αὐτοῦ γὰρ καὶ δἰ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο, ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ. The distinction between ἐν ἰδέᾳ and ἐν ἐνεργείᾳ corresponds to that between λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός in the following note.

(6) *Theoph.* ad Autol. ii. 10, treats most fully on the procession of the Logos from God, and is the first writer who refers the distinction between the λ. ἐνδιάθετος and λ. προφορικός to that doctrine: Ἔχων οὖν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ λόγον ἐνδιάθετον ἐν τοῖς ἰδίοις σπλάγχνοις, ἐγέννησεν αὐτὸν μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας ἐξερευξάμενος πρὸ τῶν ὅλων. Likewise c. 22; Οὐχ ὡς οἱ ποιηταὶ καὶ μυθόγραφοι λέγουσιν υἱοὺς θεῶν ἐκ συνουσίας γεννωμένους, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀλήθεια διηγεῖται τὸν λόγον, τὸν ὄντα διαπαντὸς ἐνδιάθετον ἐν καρδίᾳ θεοῦ. Πρὸ γὰρ τι γίνεσθαι, τοῦτον εἶχε σύμβουλον, ἑαυτοῦ νοῦν καὶ φρόνησιν ὄντα· ὁπότε δὲ ἠθέλησεν ὁ θεὸς ποιῆσαι ὅσα ἐβουλεύσατο, τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικὸν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως· οὐ κενωθεὶς αὐτὸς τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλὰ λόγον γεννήσας, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ διαπαντὸς ὁμιλῶν.

(7) In the writings of *Clement* the doctrine of the Logos forms the central point of his whole system of theology, and the mainspring of his religious feelings and sentiments. Without the Logos there is neither light nor life, (Coh. p. 87.) He is the Divine instructor (παιδαγωγός.) Pæd. iii. 12. p. 310: Πάντα ὁ λόγος καὶ ποιεῖ καὶ διδάσκει καὶ παιδαγωγεῖ· ἵππος ἄγεται χαλινῷ καὶ ταῦρος ἄγεται ζυγῷ· θηρίον βρόχῳ ἁλίσκεται· ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος μεταπλάσσεται λόγῳ· ᾧ θηρία τιθασσεύεται καὶ νηκτὰ δελεάζεται καὶ πτηνὰ κατασύρεται κ.τ.λ. Comp. the beautiful hymn εἰς τὸν παιδαγωγόν at the end of his work. [*Bennett*, l. c. app. K. p. 268, where both the original and an English translation are given.] God has created the world by the Logos; yea the Logos is the creator himself (ὁ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἀνθρώπου δημιουργός), he has given the law, inspired the prophets, through him God has manifested himself, Pæd. i. 7. p. 132—134. ii. 8. p. 215. ii. 10. p. 224. 229. iii. 3. p. 264. iii. 4. p. 269. comp. p. 273. 280. 293. 297. 307. Strom. i. 23. p. 421, 422. vii. i. p. 833. In his view (and the same opinion was held by Philo) the Logos is the ἀρχιερεύς Strom. ii. 9. p. 433. 500. He is the image (πρόσωπον) of God, by means of which God is perceived. Pæd. i. 7. p.

132. The Logos is superior to men and angels, but subordinate to the Father; *principal passage;* Strom. vii. 2. p. 831: On earth the righteous man is the most excellent being; in heaven the angels, because they are yet purer and more perfect. Τελειωτάτη δὴ καὶ ἁγιωτάτη καὶ κυριωτάτη καὶ ἡγεμονικωτάτη καὶ βασιλικωτάτη καὶ εὐεργετικικωτάτη ἡ υἱοῦ φύσις, ἡ τῷ μόνῳ παντοκράτορι προσεχεστάτη. Αὕτη ἡ μεγιστη ὑπεροχὴ, ἣ τὰ πάντα διατάσσεται κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ τὸ πᾶν ἄριστα οἰακίζει, ἀκαμάτῳ καὶ ἀτρύτῳ δυνάμει πάντα ἐργαζομένη, δι' ὧν ἐνεργεῖ τὰς ἀποκρύφους ἐννοίας ἐπιβλέπουσα. Οὐ γὰρ ἐξίσταταί ποτε τῆς αὑτοῦ περιωπῆς .ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ· οὐ μεριζόμενος, οὐκ ἀποτεμνόμενος, οὐ μεταβαίνων ἐκ τόπου εἰς τόπον πάντη δὲ ὢν πάντοτε, καὶ μηδαμῆ περιεχόμενος, ὅλος νοῦς, ὅλος φῶς πατρῷον, ὅλος ὀφθαλμὸς, πάντα ὁρῶν, πάντα ἀκούων, εἰδὼς πάντα, δυνάμει τὰς δυνάμεις ἐρευνῶν. Τούτῳ πᾶσα ὑποτέτακται στρατιὰ ἀγγέλων τε καὶ θεῶν, τῷ λόγῳ τῷ πατρικῷ τὴν ἁγίαν οἰκονομίαν ἀναδεδειγμένῳ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, δι' ὧν καὶ πάντες αὐτοῦ οἱ ἄνθρωποι· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν, οἱ δὲ οὐδέπω· καὶ οἱ μὲν ὡς φίλοι, οἱ δε ὡς οἰκέται πιστοὶ, οἱ δὲ ὡς ἁπλῶς οἰκέται. (The true knowledge of the Logos is the privilege of the true Gnostics.) Divine worship is due to the Logos, vii. 7. p. 851. quis div. salv. p. 956. (Comp. *Bennett*, l. c. p. 123—126. *Burton*, *E.*, Testimony of the Antenicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ, (Works ii. p. 171, ss.)] On the mode of generation Clement speaks less explicitly than the before mentioned writers. He attaches more importance to the immanent existence of the Logos. In his opinion, the Logos is not the word of God which *was spoken* at the creation of the world, but that which *spoke* itself; see *Dorner*, p. 446. He also holds along with the concrete idea of the individuality of the Logos another notion of a more general import, according to which the Logos is identical with the higher spiritual life, the life of ideas in general, by which the world was moved even previous to the coming of Christ, comp. Strom. v. p. 654; hence the charge of Photius, (Bibl. Cod. 109.) that Clement taught the existence of a twofold Logos of the Father, the inferior of whom appeared on earth; see *Baur*, Trinit. Lehre, p. 195. Accordingly he who studies the writings of Clement merely for the purpose of deducing a strictly doctrinal system, will not be satisfied, and like *Münsche* (Handbuch, i. p. 418.), he will see in the passages bearing upon this subject "*nothing but declamatory expressions from which no definite idea can be derived.*" On the contrary, he who takes a general view of his religious opinions, might feel more inclined to adopt the language of *Möhler*, that Clement "*has treated the dogma concerning the Logos with greater clearness than all the*

other Fathers of this period, but especially with unusual depth of feeling, and the most ardent enthusiasm." (Patrologie, p 460. 61.

(8) *Tert.* adv. Prax. c. 2: Nos unicum quidem Deum credimus, sub hac tamen dispensatione, quam œconomiam dicimus, ut unici Dei sit et filius sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil. C. 5: Ante omnia enim Deus erat solus, ipse sibi et mundus et locus et omnia. Solus autem, quia nihil aliud extrinsecus præter illum. Ceterum ne tunc quidem solus: habebat enim secum quam habebat in semetipso, rationem suam scilicet, etc. C. 8: Protulit enim Deum sermonem sicut radix fruticem et fons fluvium et sol radium; nam et istæ species probole sunt earum substantiarum, ex quibus prodeunt. In c. 9. the Son is called *portio* of the Father. Comp. Neander's Antignosticus, p. 476, ss. [*Burton*, l. c. p. 235, ss.] According to *Dorner*, p. 588. Tert. uses the word filiatio in a threefold sense; that which is new in the system of Tertullian, and of importance in reference to later times, is this, that he employs the term "Son" (instead of "Word,") in order to denote the personal existence of the Logos.

(9) *Iren.* advers. hær. ii. 28. p. 158: Si quis itaque nobis dixerit: Quomodo ergo filius prolatus a patre est? dicimus ei, quia prolationem istam sive generationem sive nuncupationem sive adapertionem aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem existentem, nemo novit, non Valentinus, non Marcion, neque Saturninus, neque Basilides, neque Angeli, neque Archangeli, neque Principes, neque Potestates, nisi solus qui generavit Pater et qui natus est Filius. Inenarrabilis itaque generatio ejus quum sit, quicunque nituntur generationes et prolationes enarrare, non sunt compotes sui, ea, quæ inenarrabilia sunt, enarrare promittentes. Quoniam enim ex cogitatione et sensu verbum emittitur, hoc utique omnes sciunt homines. Non ergo magnum quid invenerunt, qui emissiones excogitaverunt, neque absconditum mysterium, si id quod ab omnibus intelligitur, transtulerunt in unigenitum Dei verbum, et quem inenarrabilem et innominabilem vocant, hunc, *quasi ipsi obstetricaverint*, primæ generationis ejus prolationem et generationem enuntiant, adsimilantes eum hominum verbo emissionis (scilicet λόγῳ προφορικῷ.) In the opinion of Iræneus, faith in the *Son* simply rests on the παράδοσις. The Logos is both reason

(wisdom), and the Word (adv. Hær. iv. 20, 1). Adest enim ei (Deo) semper Verbum et Sapientia (Fil. et Spirit.), per quos et in quibus omnia libere et sponte fecit, ad quos et loquitur dicens: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram. The Son is in every respect equal to the Father, adv. Hær. ii. 13; Necesse est itaque, et eum, qui ex eo est Logos, imo magis autem ipsum Nun, cum sit Logos, perfectum et inpassibilem esse. In accordance with his practical tendency, Irenæus knows less of the Logos *prior* to his incarnation, than of Christ the God-man. In his opinion, the Father is the invisible of the Son, and the Son the invisible of the Father (iv. 6, 6); or the Son is the measure of the Father (iv. 2, 2); he even calls the Son and the Spirit the hands of God. Comp. *Möhler*, Patrologie, p. 357, ss. *Münscher*, Handbuch, i. p. 411, ss. *Dorner*, p. 467, ss. *Baur*, p. 172, ss. [*Burton*, l. c. pp. 75, 77, 102, etc.]

§ 43.

d. *Identification of the Terms Logos and the Son of God by Origen.*

[*Burton*, *E.*, Testimonies of the Anten. Fath. etc. p. 281–348.]

After *Tertullian* had employed the term Son in reference to the personality of the Logos more distinctly than was formerly done,(1) *Origen*, adopting this terminology,(2) was led to the idea of an eternal generation.(3) Though he endeavoured to avoid all physical emanation,(4) his doctrine gave rise to new misunderstandings, and thus to new controversies.(5)

(1) Comp. § 42, note 8.

(2) Tom. i. in Joh. App. iv. p. 22, ss., he finds fault with those who, in a onesided manner, merely adopt the term Logos ἐπὶ δὲ μόνης τῆς λόγος προσηγορίας ἱστάμενοι), and are not able to infer the identity of the terms Logos and Son from the other predicates applied to Christ; who also restrict the term *Logos* to the *Word*, imagining that the προσφορὰ πατρική consists οἱονεὶ ἐν συλλαβαῖς. In his opinion, the Logos is not merely the Word, but a transcendent, living hypostasis, the essence of all ideas, the indepen-

dent personal wisdom of God; comp. in Joh. i. 39, l. c. p. 39: Οὐ γὰρ ἐν ψιλαῖς φαντασίαις τοῦ ϑέοῦ τὴν ὑπόστασιν ἔχει ἡ σοφία αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὰ ἀναλογον τοῖς ἀνϑρωπίνοις ἐννοήμασι φαντάσματα· ἐι δὲ τις οἷός τέ ἐστιν ἀσώματον ὑπόστασιν ποικίλων ϑεωρημάτων, περιεχόντων τοὺς τῶν ὅλων λόγους, ζῶσαν καὶ οἱονεὶ ἔμψυχον ἐπενοεῖν· εἴσεται τὴν ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν κτίσιν σοφίαν τοῦ ϑεοῦ καλῶς περί αὐτῆς λέγουσαν, ὁ ϑεὸς ἔκτισέ με, κ. τ. λ. Comp. de princ. i. 2, 2: Nemo putet, nos *insubstantivum* dicere, cum filiam Dei sapientiam nominamus, etc.; and thus he calls contra Cels. vi. 64, the Logos οὐσίαν οὐσιῶν, ἰδέαν ἰδεῶν; comp. *Thomasias*, p. 113. Concerning the Son, Origen makes the same assertions which former writers made with regard to the Logos. In his opinion the Son is the medium by which the world was created, Tom. i. in Joh. Opp. Tom. iv. p. 21. As the architect builds a house, or a vessel, according to his ideas, so God created the world according to the ideas which are contained in wisdom. Comp. in Joh. Tom. xxxii. c. 18, ib. p. 449, and de princ. i. 2, (Opp. i. p. 53.) God never existed without the Wisdom (the Son); for to maintain the contrary, would virtually amount to the assertion, that God either *could* not beget, or *would* not beget, either of which is absurd and impious. But the Son is not only the Wisdom, he is also the word, the image, the mirror, the brightness of God (ἐνέργεια.) Origen too resorts to illustrations. Thus he compares God and his Son with the sun and its beams, and again with a statue and a copy of it on a reduced scale; he refers, however, this latter comparison to God's incarnate Son (the man Jesus), rather than to his eternal Son (the Logos.)

(3) It is difficult to determine whether this idea of generation is consistently carried out, since it is not quite evident whether Origen refers it to the *nature* or the *will* of the Father; see *Baur*, p. 204; on the other side comp. *Dorner*, p. 640, ss.

(4) De Princ. i. 4, (Opp. i. p. 55): Infandum autem est et illicitum, Deum patrem in generatione unigeniti Filii sui atque in substantia ejus exæquare alicui vel hominum vel aliorum animantium generanti, etc., and again: Observandum namque est, ne quis incurrat in illas absurdas fabulas eorum, qui prolationes quasdam sibi ipsis depingunt, ut divinam naturam in partes vocent, et Deum patrem quantum in se est dividant, cum hoc de incorporea natura vel leviter suspicari, non solum extremæ impietatis sit, verum etiam ultimæ insipientiæ, nec omnino ad intelligentiam consequens, ut incorporeæ naturæ substantialis

divisio possit intelligi. "The will of man proceeds from his reason, but the one cannot be separated from the other: in a similar manner we may imagine that the Son proceeds from the Father, but both are inseparable." (This illustration, though more abstract, is less vivid than that taken from the human word, § 42, note 3.)

(5) On the one hand, the subordination of the Son to the Father was the necessary consequence of a rigid adherence to the idea of a hypostasis, (comp. § 46.) On the other, the scriptural expression, υἱὸς τοῦ ϑεοῦ which is applied to Christ in his human nature, *i. e.* as the Messiah,[a] was so confounded with the same term as used by the schoolmen, that the human and the Divine natures of the Son of God were not always distinctly separated. This gave rise to new controversies; comp. however, *Dorner*, Christologie, p. 42. He thinks that the doctrine of subordination was merely resorted to, "*for the purpose of substituting several Divine hypostases for the very vague and indefinite opinions which were entertained respecting the distinctive characteristics of the different persons in the Godhead.*"

§ 44.

THE HOLY GHOST.

Keil, ob die ältesten Lehrer einen Unterschied zwischen Sohn und Vater gekannt? in Flatts Magazin für christliche Dogmatik und Moral, vol. iv. p. 34, ss. [*Burton, E.*, Testimonies of the Antenicene Fathers to the Trinity, the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, (Works, ii.) comp. the Introduct. where the literature is given.] *Georgii*, dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen über die Lehre vom h. Geist bei Justin M. in the Studien der Geistlichkeit Würtembergs, x. 2, p. 69. ss. *Hasselbach*, in the theologische Studien und Kritiken. 1839, 2. p. 376, ss.

The doctrine concerning the Holy Ghost was considered important from the practical point of view, both in reference to the inspiration of the prophets, (in the more comprehensive sense of the word), and to the witness which he bears in the hearts of men.(1) Those theologians, however, who, going beyond the Trinity of revelation, (*i. e.* the Trinity as it manifests itself in the work of redemption), endeavoured to comprehend and define the nature of the Holy Spirit, and the relation in which he stands to the Father and the Logos, involved themselves in great difficulties. Some applying the term πνεῦμα ἅγιον to what is called wisdom by the Old Testament writers, on the foundation of which, the doctrine of the Logos had been developed, made a distinction between the Wisdom and the Logos;(2) others identified the Logos with the Spirit, or expressed themselves in a vague and indefinite manner respecting their distinguishing characteristics;(3) in the writings of others, again, the idea of personality is more or less lost sight of, and the Holy Ghost appears as a mere quality, or a Divine gift and effect.(4) But the desire of bringing the doctrine of the Trinity to a conclusion led gradually to more definite views on the personality of the Holy Ghost (in distinction from the Logos.)(5)

---

[a] "*The more I endeavour to realize the manner of thinking and speaking current in the New Testament, the more I feel myself called upon to give it as my decided opinion, that the historical Son of God, as such, cannot be called God, without completely destroying the monotheistical system of the Apostles.*" Lücke, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1840, i. p. 91.

---

(1) The writings of the Apostolical Fathers contain nothing definite and connected relative to the nature of the Spirit. *Justin M.* makes, in particular, mention of the πνεῦμα προφητικὸν, (the term in question occurs twenty-two times in his Apology, nine times in Trypho. See *Semish*, II. p. 332, note), while he does not speak of the influence which he continues to exert upon believers, (ibid. p. 329.) On the contrary, *Irenæus*, iii. 24. 1, calls the Holy Ghost the communitas Christi, confirmatio fidei nostræ, scala ascensionis ad Deum, comp. iii. 17; v. 6; v. 10. and § 71. At the same time, he considers him the prophetic Spirit, and makes a distinction between the principle which animates and inspires, and that animation and inspiration itself, adv. Hær. v. 12. 2: Ἕτερόν ἐστι πνοὴ ζωῆς ἡ καὶ ψυχικὸν ἀπεργαζομένη τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ἕτερον πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν τὸ καὶ πνευματικὸν αὐτὸν ἀποτελοῦν......ἕτερον δέ ἐστι τὸ ποιηθὴν τοῦ ποιήσαντος. ἡ οὖν πνοὴ πρόσκαιρος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ἀέναον

(2) *Theoph.* ad Autol. i. 7: Ὁ δὲ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας ἐποίησε τὰ πάντα; here σοφία is either synonymous with λόγος, or forms the second member; in the former case, there would

be no mention of the Spirit whatever; in the latter he would be identical with σοφία; and this agrees better with ii. 15., where θεός, λόγος and σοφία are said to compose the Trinity, comp. § 45. *Iren.* iv. 20. p. 253: Adest enim ei (Deo) semper verbum et sapientia, Filius et Spiritus......ad quos et loquitur, dicens: faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram; and again: Deus omnia *verbo* fecit et *sapientia* adornavit. [*Burton,* l. c. p. 49—51.] comp. iv. 7. p. 236: Ministrat enim ei ad omnia sua progenies et figuratio sua, *i. e.* Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, verbum et sapientia, quibus serviunt et subjecti sunt omnes angeli. *Tert.* adv. Prax. c. 6: Nam ut primum Deus voluit ea quæ cum Sophiæ ratione et sermone disposuerat intra se, in substantias et species suas edere, ipsum primum protulit sermonem, habentem in se individuas suas, Rationem et Sophiam, ut per ipsum fierent universa, per quem erant cogitata atque disposita, immo et facta jam, quantum in Dei sensu. Hoc enim eis deerat, ut coram quoque in suis speciebus atque substantiis cognoscerentur et tenerentur. Comp. cap. 7. and de orat, i. ab initio: Dei Spiritus et Dei sermo et Dei ratio, sermo rationis et ratio sermonis et spiritus utrumque Jesus Christus, dominus noster.

(3) From the time of *Souverain* (Platonismus der Kirchenväter, p. 329, ss.), most theologians have supposed that the Fathers in general, and Justin M. in particular, made no real distinction between the Logos and the Spirit. Modern researches have, in the opinion of some, led to the same result. *Semisch,* however, has endeavoured to clear Justin from the charge in question. The principal passage bearing upon this question is, Apol. I. 33: Τὸ πνεῦμα οὖν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδὲν ἄλλο νοῆσαι θέμις, ἢ τὸν λόγον, ὅς καὶ πρωτότοκος τῷ θεῷ ἐστι, comp. c. 36. He indeed speaks there of the πνεῦμα Luc. i. 35. from which it cannot be inferred that he always identifies the Logos with the Spirit; nevertheless it cannot be denied that in this place at least he confounds the two. Tertullian, adv. Prax. c. 26. uses similar expressions, which go to prove that other Fathers beside Justin are chargeable with the same want of distinction. The same is true as regards the manner in which Justin ascribes the inspiration of the prophets, sometimes to the Logos, sometimes to the Pneuma, Apol. I. 36, and elsewhere. On the other hand, there are places in which the Son and Spirit are more distinctly separated, Apol. I. 6; I. 13; I. 60. Comp. *Theophilus,* ad Aut. II.

c. 10: Οὖτος (ὁ λόγος) ὢν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ σοφία καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου κατήρχετο εἰς τοὺς προφήτας, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν ἐλάλει τὰ περὶ τῆς ποιήσεως τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἁπάντων· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ προφῆται, ὅτε ὁ κόσμος ἐγίνετο· ἀλλὰ ἡ σοφία ἡ ἐν αὐτῷ οὖσα ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἅγιος αὐτοῦ, ὁ ἀεὶ συμπαρὼν αὐτῷ.

(4) Justin M. calls the Holy Ghost simply δωρεά, Coh. ad græc. c. 32, though he assigns to him (Apol. i. 6.) the third place in the Trinity. On the question: what relation was the Holy Spirit thought to sustain to the angels? comp. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte. i. p. 1040. Studien und Kritken, 1833, p. 773, ss. the latter essay was written in opposition to *Möhler*, Theolog. Quartalschrift, 1833, part i. p. 49, ss.

5) *Tert.* adv. Prax. 8: Tertius est Spiritus a Deo et Filio, sicut tertius a radice fructus ex frutice, et tertius a fonte rivus ex flumine, et tertius a sole apex ex radio, Ibid. 30: Spir.S. tertium nomen divinitatis et tertius gradus majestatis. But a subordinate position is officially assigned to the Spirit, Præscr. 28. *Origen*, Comm. in Joh. T. ii. 6. Opp. T. iv. p. 60, 61, acknowledges the personality of the Holy Spirit, but subordinates him to both the Father and the Son, by the latter of whom he is *created*, like all other creatures, though sufficiently distinguished from them by his Divine nature: Ἡμεῖς μέντοιγε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀγέννητον μηδὲν ἕτερον τοῦ πατρὸς ειναι πιστεύοντες, ὡς εὐσεβέστερον καὶ ἀληθὲς προσιέμεθα τὸ πάντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου γενομένων, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα πάντων εἶναι τιμιώτερον, καὶ τάξει πάντων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ γεγενημένων. [*Burton*, l. c. p. 99, ss.] Comp. T. xiii. 25. p. 234; and 34. p. 244: Οὐκ ἄτοπον δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τρέφεσθαι λέγειν. Nevertheless, there is a great difference between the Spirit of God, and other spirits created by God, comp. Comm. in ep. ad. Rom. vii. Opp. iv. p. 593. But in another passage, (which is extant only in the translation of Rufinus, de princ. i. 3. 3. Opp. i. 1. p. 61.) Origen says, that he had not as yet met with any passage in the Sacred Scriptures in which the Holy Spirit was called a created being. It is remarkable, that afterwards Epiphanius, Justinian, etc. blamed him on account of this same assertion, comp. Epiphan. 64. 5. Hieron. ad Avit. Ep. 94. quoted by *Münscher* ed. by Cölln, p. 194. *Schnitzer*, p. 43. *Neander*, i. 3. p. 1040. *Thomasius*, p. 144, ss. (where other passages are adduced.) [*Burton*, l. c. p. 89.]

§ 45.

DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

[*Burton, E.*, Testimonies of the Anten. Fath. to the Trinity, and the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, (Works, ii.) *Berrimann, W.*, An Historical Account of the Controversies that have been in the Church concerning the Doctrine of the Holy and Ever-Blessed Trinity, in eight Sermons. Lond. 1725.]

The doctrine of God *the Father,* God *the Son,* and God *the Holy Ghost,* is the doctrine of primitive Christianity, (1) but has in the New Test. a bearing only upon the Christian economy, without any pretension to speculative significance, and therefore cannot be rightly understood but in intimate connection with the history of Jesus, and the work which he accomplished. Accordingly, the belief in the *Father, Son,* and *Holy Ghost,* was considered as an essential part of the *Regula fidei,* even apart from every speculative developement of the doctrine of the Logos, and appears in what is commonly called the Apostles' creed, in this historico-epic form, without any further allusion to the unity of the Deity. The Greek word τριάς was first used by Theophilus; (2) the Latin term *trinitas,* which has a more comprehensive doctrinal import, was introduced by Tertullian. (3)

(1) Matth. xxviii. 19, (if the baptismal formula be genuine); 1 Cor. xii. 4–6; 2 Cor. xiii. 14, and elsewhere. Comp. the commentaries on these passages, *de Wette's* biblische Dogmatik, § 238, 267, *Lücke* in the Studien und Kritiken, 1840, 1. part. [*Pye Smith*, the Script. Testim. to the Messiah, iii. p. 13, ss.; iii. p. 258, ss.; *Knapp*. l. c. p. 119, ss., 132, ss.]

(2) *Theoph.* ad Autol. ii. 15: Αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι [πρὸ] τῶν φωστήρων γεγονυῖαι, τύποι εἰσίν τῆς τριάδος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ. Τετάρτῳ δὲ τύπῳ [τόπῳ] ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ προσδεὴς τοῦ φωτὸς, ἵνα ᾖ θεὸς, λόγος. σοφία, ἄνθρωπος. Here we have indeed the word τριάς, but not in the ecclesiastical sense of the term Trinity; for as ἄνθρωπος is mentioned in the fourth place, it is evident that the τριὰς can not be taken here as a perfect whole consisting of three persons

joined into one; besides the term σοφία is used instead of τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Comp. *Suicer*, thesaurus s. v. τριάς, where the passage from the (spurious) treatise of Justin de expositione fidei, p. 379, is cited (Μονὰς γὰρ ἐν τριάδι νοεῖται καὶ τριὰς ἐν μονάδι γνωρίζεται κ. τ. λ.); this passage, however, proves as little concerning the use of language during that period, as ,the treatise φιλόπατρις erroneously ascribed to Lucian. Clem. Strom. iv. 7. p. 588, knows a ἁγία τριάς, but in a different sense (faith, love, hope.) On the terminology of Origen, comp. *Thomasius*, p. 285. [Comp. *Burton*, l. c. p. 34–36, where the subject is treated at great length.]

(3) *Tertullian* de pudic. c. 21: Nam et ecclesia proprie et principaliter ipse est spiritus, in quo est *Trinitas* unius divinitatis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus S.) accordingly the Holy Spirit is the principle which constitutes the unity of the persons. Comp. adv. Prax. 2. and 3, [*Burton*, l. c. p. 68, ss.] *Cyprian* and *Novatian* immediately adopted this term. Cypr. Ep. 73, p. 200 (with reference to baptism.) Novat. de Trinitate. [*Burton*, l c. p. 107—109; p. 116—123.]

§ 46.

MONARCHIANISM AND SUBORDINATION.

The strict distinction which was drawn between the persons in the Trinity, led, in the first instance, to the system of *Subordination*, according to which the Son was thought inferior to the Father, and the Holy Spirit inferior to both the Father and the Son.(1) Such a classification gave some ground to the charge of Tritheism which was frequently made against the orthodox.(2) Accordingly, they were compelled to clear themselves from all appearance of Tritheism in opposition to the Monarchians, who, abandoning the said distinction, in order to hold fast the unity of the Godhead, exposed themselves to the charge of confounding the persons (Patripassianism), or the imputation of that heretical tendency which denies the Divinity of Christ.(3) *Origen*, endeavouring to define the nature of the persons, and to determine the exact relation which they maintain to each other, went to the other extreme;(4) orthodoxy was so much extended that it became heterodoxy, and thus gave rise to the Arian controversy in the following period.

(1) *Justin, M.* Apol. i. c. 13: ......υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὄντως Θεοῦ μαθόντες (scil. τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν) καὶ ἐν δευτέρᾳ χώρᾳ ἔχοντες, πνεῦμά τε προφητικὸν ἐν τρίτῃ τάξει.—There are also passages in the writings of *Irenæus* which appear favourable to the idea of subordination, *e. g.* adv. Hær. ii. 28. 6 8; v. 18. 2: Super omnia quidem pater, et ipse est caput Christi; but elsewhere he represents the Logos as in every respect equal to God, and not as a subordinate being, (comp. § 42, note 9.) *It cannot be denied that Irenæus here contradicts himself, and it would be a useless labour to remove this contradiction by artificial interpretation.*" *Duncker*, p. 56; comp. p. 70, ss. *Dorner*, p. 409, ss. *Tert.* advers. Prax. c. 2: Tres autem non statu, sed gradu, nec substantia, sed forma, nec potestate, sed specie: unius autem substantiæ et unius status et unius potestatis, quia unus Deus, ex quo et gradus isti et formæ et species in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti deputantur. Comp. c. 4, ss.

(2) Thus *Justin M.* says, dial. cum Tryph. c. 56: The Father and the Son are distinct, not γνώμῃ, but ἀριθμῷ; and from the proposition that, if I have a wife, it does not necessarily follow that I am the wife herself, *Tertullian* (adv. Prax. c. 10,) draws the conclusion, that, if God has a Son, it does not necessarily follow that he is the Son himself. He defends himself against the charge of Tritheism, adv. Prax. 3: Simplices enim quique, ne dixerim impudentes et idiotæ, quæ major semper credentium pars est, quoniam et ipsa regula fidei a pluribus Diis seculi ad unicum et Deum verum transfert, non intelligentes *unicum* quidem, sed *cum sua œconomia* esse credendum, expavescunt ad œconomiam. Numerum et dispositionem trinitatis divisionem præsumunt unitatis; quando unitas ex semetipsa derivans trinitatem, non destruatur ab illa, sed administretur. Itaque duos et tres jam jactitant a nobis prædicari, se vero unius Dei cultores præsumunt, quasi non et unitas irrationaliter collecta, hæresin faciat, et trinitas rationaliter expensa, veritatem constituat. Comp. also *Novat.* de trin. 22: Unum enim, non unus esse dicitur, quoniam nec ad numerum refertur, sed ad societatem alterius expromitur......Unum autem quod ait, ad concor-

diam et eandem sententiam et ad ipsam caritatis societatem pertinet, ut merito unum sit pater et filius per concordiam et per amorem et per dilectionem. [*Burton*, l. c. p. 120, 121.] He also appeals to Apollos and Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 8; qui autem plantat et qui rigat, unum sunt.

(3) Concerning the different classes of Unitarians, comp. § 24. notes 4 and 5, and § 42. It is self-evident, that all who held Christ to be a mere man, also rejected the doctrine of the Trinity. They may be called deistico-rationalistic *Antitrinitarians;* God in his abstract unity was in their view so remote from the world, and confined to his heaven, that he had no abode in Christ himself. They widely differ from those who, apprehensive of lessening the dignity of Christ, taught that God himself had assumed humanity *in* him, and did not think it necessary to suppose the existence of a particular hypostasis. The name *modalistic* Antitrinitarians would be more appropriate in their case (thus *Heinichen*, de Alogis, p. 34); or if the relation of God to Christ be compared to that in which he stands to the world, they might be called *pantheistic* Antitrinitarians, for they imagined God, as it were, expanded or extended in the person of Christ. Among their number are *Praxeas* and *Beryllus*, the forerunners of *Sabellius*, the former of whom was combated by Tertullian, the latter by Origen. The opinion of Praxeas, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one and the same (ipsum eundemque esse), which virtually amounted to the later ὁμοούσιος, was so interpreted by Tertullian, ipsum patrum passum esse, adv. Prax. c. 20, 29, whence the heretical appellation Patripassiani. [*Burton*, Bampton Lecture, note 103, p. 588, and Testim. of the Antenic. Fath. to the Trinity, etc. p. 68–83. *Neander*, l. c. ii. p. 260–262.] Philastr. Hær. 65. The views of *Noëtus* were similar, Theod. Fab. Hær. iii. 3: Ἕνα φασὶν εἶναι θεὸν καὶ πατέρα, τῶν ὅλων δημιουργόν· ἀφανῆ μὲν ὅταν ἐθέλῃ, φαινόμενον δὲ ἡνίκα ἂν βούληται καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀόρατον εἶναι καὶ ὁρώμενον, καὶ γεννητὸν καὶ ἀγέννητον· ἀγέννητον μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, γεννητὸν δε ὅτε ἐκ παρθένου γεννηθῆναι ἠθέλησε· ἀπαθῆ καὶ ἀθάνατον, καὶ πάλιν αὖ παθητὸν καὶ θνητόν. Ἀπαθὴς γὰρ ὤν, φησί, τὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ πάθος ἐθελήσας ὑπέμεινε· τοῦτον καὶ υἱὸν ὀμομάζουσι καὶ πατέρα, πρὸς τὰς χρείας τοῦτο κἀκεῖνο καλούμενον. Compare Epiph. Hær. vii. 1. [*Burton*, Bampton Lecture, note 103, p. 589, 590.] *Beryllus* endeavoured to evade the inferences which may be drawn alike from Patripassianism and from Pantheism, by admitting a difference *after* the assumption of humanity,

Euseb. vi. 33: Βήρυλλος ὁ μικρῷ πρόσθεν δεδηλωμένος Βοστρῶν τῆς Ἀραβίας ἐπίσκοπος τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν παρεκτρέπων κανόνα, ξένα τινὰ τῆς πίστεως παρεισφέρειν ἐπειρᾶτο, τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν λέγειν τολμῶν μὴ προϋφεστάναι κατ' ἰδίαν οὐσίας περιγραφὴν πρὸ τῆς εἰς ἀνθρώπους ἐπιδημίας μηδὲ μὴν θεότητα ἰδίαν ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ἐμπολιτευομένην αὐτῷ μόνην τὴν πατρικήν. Comp. *Ullmann* in the dissert. quoted § 24, note 5, and *Fork*, diss. Christ. Beryll. Bostr. According to *Baur*, (Dreieinigkeitslehre, p. 289,) Beryllus ought to be classed together with Artemon and Theodotus; *Meier*, however, supposes a certain distinction between them. To those who adopted the tendency of Noëtus belong *Beron* and his followers, who were combated by Hippolytus; comp. *Dorner*, p. 536, ss.

(4 On the one hand, *Origen* asserts that the Son is equal to the Father, Hom. viii. in Jerem. 2. Opp. iii. p. 171: Πάντα γὰρ ὅσα τοῦ θεοῦ, τοιαῦτα ἐν αὐτῷ (υἱῷ) ἐστίν. He also speaks of the three persons in the Trinity as the three sources of salvation, so that he who does not thirst after all of them cannot find God, ibid. Hom. xviii. 9. Opp. iii. p. 251, 252. Nevertheless the subordination of the Son is prominently brought forward, and forms, together with the strict hypostatic distinction, the characteristic feature of Origen's doctrine. The Son is called δεύτερος θεός contra Cels. v. 608; comp. vii. 735: Ἄξιος τῆς δευτερευουσης μετὰ τὸν θεὸν τῶν ὅλων τιμῆς. De orat. i. p. 222: Ἕτερος κατ' οὐσίαν καὶ ὑποκειμενός ἐστι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρός. Comp. also in Joh. Tom. ii. 2. Opp. T. iv. p. 50, where great stress is laid upon the distinction made by Philo between θεός and ὁ θεός. How far this system of subordination was sometimes carried, may be seen from Origen de Orat. c. 15. Opp. T. i. 222, where he entirely rejects the practice of addressing prayer to Christ (the Son;) for, he argues, since the Son is a particular hypostasis, we must pray either to the Son only, or to the Father only, or to both. To pray to the Son, and not to the Father, would be most improper (ἀτοπώτατον;) to pray to both, is impossible, because we should have to use the plural number: παράσχεσθε, εὐεργετήσατε, ἐπιχορηγήσατε, σώσατε, that which is contrary to Scripture, and the doctrine of One God; thus nothing remains but to pray to the Father alone. To pray to the Father through the Son, a prayer in an improper sense (invocatio?) is quite a different thing; contra Cels. v. 4. Opp. i. p. 579: Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν καὶ προσευχὴν καὶ ἔντευξιν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερέως, ἐμψύχου λόγου καὶ θεοῦ. Δεησόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λόχου, καὶ ἐντευξόμεθα αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν καὶ προσευξόμεθα

δὲ, ἐὰν δυνώμεθα κατακούειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως (si modo propriam precationis possimus ab impropria secernere notionem.) Comp. however, § 43.

§ 47.

DOCTRINE OF HE CREATION OF THE WORLD.

C. F. Rössler, Philosophia veteris ecclesiæ de mundo, Tubingæ, 1783. 4. [*Knapp*, Lectures on Christ. Theology, transl. by L. Woods, p. 144–146.]

Concerning this doctrine, as well as the doctrine of God in general, the early Christians adopted the Monotheistic views of the Jews, and, in the simple exercise of faith, received the Mosaic account of the creation (Gen. i.) as Divine revelation. Even the definition ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων which was not introduced into the Jewish theology until afterwards (2 Macc. vii. 28,) found its way into primitive Christianity.(1) The orthodox firmly adhered to the doctrine that God, the Almighty Father, who is also the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ, is at the same time the creator of heaven and of earth,(2) and rejected the notion of eternal matter.(3) They did this in opposition to the Gnostics, according to whom the creator of the world was distinct from the Supreme God, as well as to the assertion made by some of them, and also by *Hermogenes*, that matter has existed from everlasting.(4) But the speculative tendency of the Alexandrian school could not be satisfied with the notion of the creation having taken place in time. Accordingly *Origen* resorted to an allegorical interpretation of the work of the six days (Hexaëmeron,)(5) and following the example of *Clement*(6) (which, however, is doubtful, and to say the least, betrays indecision,) he propounded the doctrine of an *eternal* creation in still more definite terms than Clement. But he did not maintain the eternity of matter as an independent power.(7) On the contrary, *Irenæus*, from his practical position, reckoned all questions about what God had done before the creation among the improper questions of human inquisitiveness.(8)

---

(1) Comp. Hebr. xi. 3, and the commentaries upon that passage. Accordingly the Shepherd of *Hermas* teaches, Lib. ii. Mand. 1: Πρῶτον πάντων πίστευσον, ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς, ὁ τὰ πάντα κτίσας καὶ καταρτίσας, καὶ ποιήσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι τὰ πάντα. Conf. Euseb. v. 8.

(2) The popular view was always, that the *Father* is the creator, though the creation *through* the Son formed a part of the orthodox faith. Accordingly, we find that sometimes the Father, sometimes the Logos, is called the creator of the world (δημιουργός, ποιητής.) Thus *Justin, M.*, says, dial. c. Tryph. c. 16: Ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων θεός, comp. Apol. i. 61: Τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ. On the other hand, Coh. ad Græc. c. 15: Τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον, δἰ οὗ οὐρανὸς καὶ γῆ καὶ πᾶσα ἐγένετο κτίσις, comp. Apol. i. 64. Likewise *Theophilus* ad Autol. ii. 10; Ὅτε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς πεποίηκε τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἔφη· ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν. The phrase ἐν ἀρχῇ was understood in the same sense as διὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, and ἀρχή, explained to denote the Logos, see *Semisch*, p. 335. Thus *Irenæus* also taught, iii. 11: Et hæc quidem sunt principia Evangelii, unum Deum fabricatorem hujus universitatis, eum qui et per prophetas sit annunciatus et qui per Moysem legis disquisitionem fecerit, *Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi* annunciantia et præter hunc alterum Deum nescientia, neque alterum patrem. On the contrary, he says, v. 18. 3: Mundi enim factor vere verbum Dei est; hic autem est Dominus noster, qui in novissimus temporibus homo factus est, in hoc mundo existens et secundum invisibilitatem continet quæ facta sunt omnia, et in universa conditione infixus, quoniam verbum Dei gubernans et disponens omnia et propter hoc in sua venit. That *Clement* of Alexandria called the Logos, as such, the creator of the world, has already been remarked, § 42, note 7. For the various appellations ποιητής, κτιστής, δημιουργός, see *Suicer* under the last mentioned word. [*Burton*, Bampton Lect. note 21, p. 320; n. 50, p. 410.]

(3) *Theoph.* ad Autol. ii. 4, says against the followers of Plato: Εἰ δὲ θεὸς ἀγέννητος καὶ ὕλη ἀγέννητος, οὐκ ἔτι ὁ θεὸς ποιητὴς τῶν ὅλων ἐστί. Comp. *Iren.* fragm. sermonis ad Demetr. p. 348. [Comp. *Burton*, l. c. note 18.] Tert. adv. Hermogenem, espec. c. i. and *Neander*, Antignosticus, l. c. In reference to the objections of

Hermogenes, he admits that the different names of God: *Sovereign, Judge, Father,* etc. are not eternal, but coeval with the subjects of dominion, etc. Yet God himself is not the less eternal.

(4) Hermogenes, a painter, lived towards the conclusion of the second century, probably at Carthage. 'According to Tertullian (adv. Hermog.) he maintained that God has created the world either out of himself, or out of nothing, or out of something already in existence. But he could not create the world out of himself, for he is indivisible; nor out of nothing, for as he himself is the supreme good, he would have created a perfectly good world; nothing therefore remains but that he has created the world out of matter already in existence. This matter (ὕλη) is consequently eternal like God himself; both principles were distinctly separate from each other from the beginning, God as the creating and imparting, matter as the receiving principle. Whatever part of this matter resists the creating principle, constitutes the evil in the world. But it was only in this point that Hermogenes agreed with the Gnostics; in other respects, and especially in reference to the doctrine of emanation, he joined the orthodox in opposing them. Comp. *Böhmer* (*Guil.*) de Hermogene Africano, Sundiæ 1832, and *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, i. 3, p. 974, ss [transl. ii. p. 249–251.] Antignosticus, p. 350–355; 424–442. *Leopold*, Hermogenis de origine mundi sententia, Budissæ, 1844.

(5) De principiis iv. 16. Opp. i. p. 174, 175: Τίς γὰρ νοῦν ἔχων οἰήσεται πρώτην καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν, ἑσπέραν τε καὶ πρωΐαν χωρὶς ἡλίου γεγονέναι καὶ σελήνης καὶ ἄστρων, κ. τ. λ. Comp. § 33, note 4.

(6) According to Photius Bibl. Cod. c. 9, p. 89. *Clement of Alex.* is said to have taught that matter had no beginning (ὕλην ἄχρονον); with this statement comp. Strom. vi. 16, p. 812, 813: Οὐ τοίνυν ὥσπερ τινὲς ὑπολαμβάνουσι τὴν ἀνάπαυσιν τοῦ θεοῦ πέπαυται ποιῶν ὁ θεός· ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὤν, εἰ παύσεταί ποτε ἀγαθοεργῶν, καὶ τοῦ θεὸς εἶναι παύσεται. But in other passages Clement most distinctly acknowledges that the world is a work of God; *e. g.* Coh. p. 54, 55: Μόνος γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ μόνος ὄντως ἐστὶ θεός· ψιλῷ τῷ βούλεσθαι δημιουργεῖ, καὶ τῷ μόνον ἐθελῆσαι αὐτὸν ἕπεται τὸ γεγενῆσθαι.

(7) *Origen*, indeed, opposes the eternity of matter (in the heathen and heretical sense), de princ. ii. 4, and in other places, *e. g.* Comment. in Joh. xxxii. 9. Opp. T. iv. p. 429; but though from his idealistic position he denied eternity to *matter*, which

he held to be the root of evil, he nevertheless assumed the eternal creation of innumerable ideal worlds, solely because he, as little as Clement, could conceive of God as unoccupied (otiosam enim et immobilem dicere naturam Dei, impium enim simul et absurdum), de princ. iii. 5. Opp. T. i. p. 149: Nos vero consequenter respondebimus, observantes regulam pietatis et dicentes, quoniam non tunc primum, cum visibilem istam mundum fecit Deus, cœpit operari, sed sicut post corruptionem hujus erit aliens mundus, ita et antequam his esset, fuisse alios credimus. It might be questioned whether Origen, in the use of the pronoun "*nos*" in the subsequent part of the passage, intended to enforce his own belief upon the church, or whether he employed the plural number merely in his character as author; comp. *Rössler*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, i. p. 177, and *Schnitzer*, l. c. Comp. also *Thomasius*, p. 153, ss., 169, ss.

(8) *Iren.* ii. 28, p. 157, (ii. 47, p. 175, Grabe): Ut puta, si quis interroget, antequam mundum faceret Deus, quid agebat? dicimus, quoniam ista responsio subjacet Deo. Quoniam autem mundus hic factus est, apotelestos a Deo, temporale initium accipiens, Scripturæ nos docent; quid autem ante hoc Deus sit operatus, nulla scriptura manifestat. Subjacet ergo hæc responsio Deo. Respecting the important position which the doctrine of Irenæus concerning the creation of the world occupies in his theological system, see *Duncker*, p. 8.

§ 48.

PROVIDENCE AND GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.

Though the doctrine of the existence of the world for the sake of the human race only, may be so corrupted as to give rise to selfish principles, it is nevertheless founded upon the consciousness of a specific distinction between man and all other creatures, at least of this earth, and supported by allusions in the Sacred Scriptures.(1) Accordingly, the primitive Christians considered the creation to be a voluntary act of Divine love, inasmuch as God does not stand in need of his creatures for the promotion of his own glory.(2) But man, being the end of creation,(3) is also pre-eminently the subject of Divine providence, and the whole vast economy of creation, with its laws and its miracles, is made subservient to the higher designs of the education of mankind. The Christian doctrine of providence, which was received by the Fathers in opposition to the objections of ancient philosophy,(4) is remote, on the one hand, from Stoicism and the rigid dogma of a εἱμαρμένη held by the Gnostics,(5) and on the other, from the system of Epicurus, according to which it is unworthy of the Deity to concern himself about the affairs of man.(6) Here again the teachers of the Alexandrian school endeavoured to avoid as much as possible the use of anthropomorphitic language(7) in connection with the idea that God takes care even of individuals, and attempted to reconcile the liberty of man(8) with the love and justice of God.(9)

(1) Matth. vi. 26; 1 Cor. ix. 9, 10.

(2) *E. g.* Clement of Alex. Pæd. iii. 1. 250: Ἀνενδεὴς δὲ μόνος ὁ Θεὸς καὶ χαίρει μάλιστα μὲν καθαρεύοντας ἡμᾶς ὁρῶν τῷ τῆς διανοίας κοσμῷ.

(3) Justin M. Apol. i. 10: Καὶ πάντα τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀγαθὸν ὄντα δημιουργῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀμόρφου ὕλης δι' ἀνθρώπους δεδιδάγμεθα. Comp. Athen. de resurr. c. 12. Iren. v. 29. 1; iv. 5. 1; iv. 7. 4. Tert. advers. Marc. i. 13: Ergo nec mundus Deo indignus, nihil etenim Deus indignum se fecit, etsi mundum homini, non sibi fecit. Orig. contra Cels. iv. 74. p. 558, 559, and ibid, 99, p. 576: Κέλσος μὲν οὖκ λεγέτω, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρώπῳ, ὡς οὐδὲ λέοντι οὐδ' οἷς ὀνομάζει. Ἡμεῖς δ' ἐροῦμεν, οὐ λέοντι ὁ δημιουργὸς, οὐδὲ ἀετῷ οὐδὲ δελφῖνι ταῦτα πεποίηκεν, ἀλλὰ πάντα διὰ τὸ λογικὸν ζῶον.

(4) See the objections of Cæcilius ap. Minucius Felix, c. 5, ss., and, on the other hand, the oration of Octavius, c. 17. and 18, c. 20. 32, and especially the beautiful passage, c. 33: Nec nobis de nostra frequentia blandiamur: multi nobis videmur, sed Deo admodum pauci sumus. Nos gentes nationesque distinguimus: Deo una domus est mundus hic totus. Reges tantum regni sui per officia ministrorum universa novere: Deo indiciis non opus est; non solum in oculis ejus, sed et in sinu vivimus. Comp. Athen. leg. c. 22, in calce.

(5) On the opinion of the Gnostic *Bardesanes* respecting the εἱμαρμένη (fate,) and the influence of stars, comp. Photius Bibl.

Cod. 223. Euseb. Præp. vi. 10. *Neander's* gnostiche Systeme, p. 198. [*Neander*, history of the Christ. Relig. and Church during the first three centuries, transl. by *H. J. Rose*, ii. p. 97: "He (Bardesanes) therefore, although like many of those who inclined to Gnosticism, he busied himself with astrology, contended against the doctrine of such an influence of the stars (εἱμαρμένη) as should be supposed to settle the life and affairs of man by *necessity*. Eusebius, in his great literary treasure house, the præparatio evangelica, has preserved a large fragment of this remarkable work; he here introduces, among other things, the Christians dispersed over so many countries, as an example of the absurdity of supposing that the stars irresistibly influenced the character of a people."] *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 234. *C. Kühner*, astronomiæ et astrologiæ in doctrina Gnostic. vestigia, P. I. Bardesanis Gnostici numina astralia. Hildburgh. 1833. [Comp. also *Gieseler*, l. c. i. § 46. n. 2, and *Burton*, Lect. on Ecclesiast. hist. Lect. xx. p. 182, 183.]

(6) Comp. especially the objections of Celsus in the work of Origen: God interferes as little with the affairs of man, as with those of monkeys and flies, etc., especially in lib. iv. Though Celsus was not a disciple of Epicurus, as Origen and Lucian would have him to be, but rather a follower of Plato (according to Neander [Hist. of the Ch. transl. i. 166]), yet these expressions savour very much of Epicureanism. [Comp. *Lardner*, Works, vii. 211—212.]

(7) According to *Clement* there is no contrast between the whole and its parts in the sight of God, (comp. also Minuc. Fel. note 4.): ᾿Αθρόως τε γὰρ πάντα καὶ ἕκαστον ἐν μέρει μιᾷ προσβολῇ προσβλέπει Strom. vi. p. 821, comp. the work of Origen contra Cels.

(8) The doctrine of the *concursus*, as it was afterwards termed, is found in Clem. Strom. vi. 17. p. 821, ss. Many things owe their existence to human calculation, though they are, as it were, kindled by God, as combustibles are kindled by the lightning, (τὴν ἔναυσιν εἰληφότα.) Thus health is preserved by medical skill, the carriage by fencing, riches by industrious art (χρηματιστικὴ τέχνη); but the Divine πρόνοια and human συνέργεια always work together.

(9) Comp. § 39, note 8. In opposition to the Gnostics, who derived evil not from the Supreme God, but from the demiurgus, *Irenæus* observes adv. Hær. iv. 39, p. 285. (iv. 76, p. 380. Gr.), that through the contrast of good and evil in the world, the

former shines the more brightly. Spirits, he further remarks, may exercise themselves in distinguishing between good and evil; how could they know the former, without having some idea of the latter? But in a categorical manner he precludes all further questions: Non enim tu Deum facis, sed Deus te facit. Si ergo opera Dei es, manum artificis tui expecta, opportune omnia facientem: opportune autem, quantum ad te attinet, qui efficeris. Præsta autem ei cor tuum molle et tractabile, et custodi figuram, qua te figuravit artifex, habens in temetipso humorem, ne induratus amittas vestigia digitorum ejus......and further on: Si igitur tradideris ei, quod est tuum, *i. e.* fidem in eum et subjectionem, recipies ejus artem et eris perfectum opus Dei. Si autem non credideris ei et fugeris manus ejus, erit causa imperfectionis in te, qui non obedisti, sed non in illo, qui vocavit, etc. At all events, the best and soundest Theodicè! To a speculative mind like that of *Origen*, the existence of evil would present a strong inducement to explain its origin, though he could not but be aware of the difficulties with which this subject is beset. Comp. espec. de princ. ii. 9. Opp. i. p. 97; contra Celsum iv. 62, p. 551. (an extract of which is given by *Rössler*, vol. i. p. 232, ss.) Different reasons are adduced in vindication of the existence of evil in the word; thus it serves to exercise the ingenuity of man (power of invention, etc.); but he draws special attention to the connection between physical and moral imperfections, evil and sin. Comp. the opinion of *Thomasius* concerning the Theodicè of Origen, p. 57, 58.

§ 49.

ANGELOLOGY AND DEMONOLOGY.

Suicer, thesaurus s. v. *ἄγγελος*. *Cotta*, Disputationes 2, succinctam doctrinæ de angelis historiam exhibentes, Tüb. 1765. 4. *Schmid*, Hist. dogm. de angelis tutelaribus, in Illgens histor. theol. Abhandlungen, i. p. 24–27. *Keil*, de angelorum malorum et dæmoniorum cultu apud gentiles, Opusc. acad. p. 584–601. (*Gaab*), Abhandlungen zur Dogmengeschichte der ältesten griechischen Kirche, Jena, 1790, p. 97–136. *Usteri*, paulin. Lehrbegriff. 4th edit. Appendix, 3. p. 421, ss.—[*Dr. L. Mayer*, Scriptural Idea of Angels, in Amer. Biblic. Reposit. xii. 356—388. *Moses Stuart*, Sketches of Angelology in Bibliotheca Sacra, No. I. *Knapp*, l. c. p. 180, ss. *Walter Scott*, The existence of evil spirits proved, London, 2d edit. 1845. *Kitto*, Cyclop. of Bibl. Liter. arts. Angels, Demons, Satan.]

The doctrine of Good and Evil Spirits forms an important appendix to the chapters on creation, providence, and the government of the world. Concerning angels, the general opinion was, that they constitute a part of the whole creation; some, however, thought that they took an active part in the work of creation, or considered them as the agents of special providence. The doctrine of Satan and demons stands in close connection with the doctrine of the existence of physical and moral evil in the world.

§ 50.

THE ANGELS.

Though the primitive church, as *Origen* asserts, did not establish any definite doctrine on this subject, (1) we nevertheless meet with several declarations respecting the nature of angels. Thus many of the earlier Fathers rejected the notion, that they had taken part in the work of creation,(2) and maintained, on the contrary, that they are created beings and ministering spirits.(3) In opposition to the doctrine of emanation and of æons,(4) they even ascribed bodies to them, which were however admitted to be composed of much finer substance than that belonging to human bodies.(5) The idea of guardian angels was connected in part with the mythical notion of geniuses.(6) But no traces are to be found during this period of a true worship of angels within the pale of the Catholic church.(7)

(1) De princ. prooem. 10. Opp. i. p. 49: Est etiam illud in ecclesiastica prædicatione, esse angelos Dei quosdam et virtutes bonas, qui ei ministrant ad salutem hominum consummandam; sed quando isti creati sint, vel quales aut quomodo sint, non satis in manifesto designatur.

(2) *Iren.* i. 22. and 24, (against the opinions of Saturninus and Carpocrates) comp. ii. 2, p. 117: Si enim (Deus) mundi fabri-

cator est, angelos ipse fecit, aut etiam causa creationis eorum ipse fuit. III. 8. 3: Quoniam enim sive angeli, sive archangeli, sive throni, sive dominationes ab eo, qui super omnes est Deus, et constituta sunt et facta sunt per verbum ejus. Comp. also iv. 6. 7: Ministrat ei (patri) ad omnia sua progenies et figuratio sua, *i. e.* Filius et Spir. S., verbum et sapientia, *quibus serviunt et subjecti sunt* omnes angeli. Comp. *Duncker,* p. 108, ss., and *Baur,* Dreieinigk. lehre, p. 175. The latter thinks, that from the manner in which the earliest Fathers frequently bring the angels into close connection with the persons of the Trinity, it follows that their views respecting this great mystery itself were yet very indefinite.

(3) "*Justin M. regards the angels as personal beings who possess a permanent existence,*" *Semisch,* ii. p. 341. Dial. c. Tryph. c. 128: Ὅτι μεν οὖν εἰσὶν ἄγγελοι, καὶ ἀεὶ μένοντες, καὶ μὴ ἀναλυόμενοι εἰς ἐκεῖνο, ἐξ οὗπερ γεγόνασιν, ἀποδέδεικται...... *Athen.* leg. c. 10: Πλῆθός ἀγγέλων καί λειτουργῶν φαμεν, οὓς ὁ ποιητὴς καί δήμιουργὸς κόσμου θεὸς διά τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγου διένειμε παί διέταξε περί τε τὰ στοιχεῖα εἶναι καί τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸν κόσμον καί τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν τούτων εὐταξίαν. Comp. c. 24, and *Clem.* Strom. vi. 17, p. 822, 824; according to him the angels have received charge over provinces, towns, etc. Clement, however, distinguishes *the* ἄγγελος, מַלְאַךְ יְהוָֹה from the other angels, and connects him in some degree with the Logos, though he assigns to him an inferior rank. Comp. Strom. vii. 2, p. 831–833. He also speaks of a mythical Angelus Jesus, Pæd. i. 7. p. 133, comp. *G. Bulli* Def. fidei nic. sect. 1. cap. 1. (de Christo sub angeli forma apparente) Opp. Lond. 1703, fol. p. 9. [*Pye Smith,* Script. Test. to the Mess. i. p. 445-464.] On the employments of angels comp. Orig. contra Cels. v. 29. Opp. i. p. 598, and Hom. xii. in Luc. Opp. iii. p. 945. [*Knapp,* l. c. p. 187.

(4) *Philo* had already converted those angels who are individually mentioned, (*e. g.* the Cherubim) into Divine powers, see *Dähne,* p. 227, ss. *Justin, M.* also informs us that in his time some had compared the relation in which the angels stand to God, to that which exists between the sun and its beams: but he decidedly rejects this opinion, Dial. c. Tryph. c. 128. Comp. *Tert.* adv. Prax. c. 3. (in connection with the doctrine of the Trinity): Igitur si et monarchia divina per tot legiones et exercitus angelorum administratur, sicut scriptum est, millies millia adsistebant ei, et millies centena millia apparebant ei: nec ideo

unius esse desiit, ut desinat monarchia esse, quia per tanta millia virtutum procuratur, etc.

(5) *Justin M.* attaches great importance to the body of angels which is analogous to that of man. Their food is manna, Psal. lxxviii. 25; the two angels who appeared to Abraham, (Gen. xviii. 1, ss.) differed from the Logos who accompanied them, in partaking of the meat set before them, in reality and after the manner of men, comp. dial. c. Tryph. c. 57. and *Semisch*, II. p. 343. As regards their intellectual powers and moral condition, Justin assigns an inferior position to the angels, *Semisch*, p. 344. 45. *Tertullian* points out the difference between the body of Christ and that of the angels, de carne Christi, c. 6: Nullus unquam angelus ideo descendit, ut crucifigeretur, ut mortem experiretur, ut a morte suscitaretur. Si nunquam ejusmodi fuit causa angelorum corporandorum, habes causam, cur non nascendi acceperint carnem. Non venerant mori, ideo nec nasci......Igitur probent angelos illos, carnem de sideribus concepisse. Si non probant, quia nec scriptum est, nec Christi caro inde erit, cui angelorum accommodant exemplum. Constat, angelos carnem non propriam gestasse, utpote naturas substantiæ spiritalis, et si corporis alicujus, sui tamen generis; in carnem autem humanam transfigurabiles ad tempus videri et congredi cum hominibus posse. Igitur, cum relatum non sit, unde sumpserint carnem, relinquitur intellectui nostro, non dubitare, hoc esse proprium angelicæ potestatis, ex nulla materia corpus sibi sumere. *Tatian*, Or. c. 15: Δαίμονες δὲ πάντες σαρκίον μὲν οὐ κέκτηνται, πνευματικὴ δέ ἐστιν αὐτοῖς ἡ σύμπηξις, ὡς πυρὸς ὡς ἀέρος. But these ethereal bodies of the angels can be perceived by those only in whom the Spirit of God dwells, not by the natural man. In comparison with other creatures they might be designated incorporeal beings, and *Ignat.* ad Trall. calls them ἀσωμάτους φύσεις. *Clement* also says, Strom. vi. 7, p. 769, that they have neither ears, nor tongues, nor lips, nor entrails, nor organs of respiration, etc. Comp. Orig. princ. in prooem. § 9. On the question, whether the Fathers taught the spiritual nature of the angels at all, see *Semisch*, II. p. 342.

(6) This idea had already occurred in the Shepherd of *Hermas*, lib. ii. mand. vi. 2: Δύο εἰσὶν ἄγγελοι μετὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, εἷς τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ εἷς τῆς πονηρίας· καὶ ὁ μὲν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἄγγελος τρυφερός ἐστι καὶ αἰσχυντηρὸς καὶ πρᾶος καί ἡσύχιος. Ὅταν οὖν οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν καρδιαν σοῦ ἀναβῇ, εὐθέως λαλεῖ μετὰ σοῦ περί δικαιοσύνης, περὶ ἁγνείας, περί σεμνότητος καὶ περὶ αὐταρκείας, καὶ περί παντὸς ἔργου δικαΐου, καὶ περὶ πάσης ἀρετῆς ἐνδόξου. Ταῦτα

πάντα ὅταν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σοῦ ἀναβῇ, γίνωσκε ὅτι ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς δικαιοσύνης μετὰ σοῦ ἐστιν· τούτῳ οὖν πίστευε καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐγκρατὴς αὐτοῦ γενοῦ. Ὅρα οὖν καὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τῆς πονηρίας τὰ ἔργα. Πρῶτον πάντων ὀξύχολός ἐστι καὶ πίκρὸς καὶ ἄφρων, καὶ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ καταστρέφοντα τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ· ὅταν αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν σοῦ ἀναβῇ, γνῶθι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. (Fragm. ex doctr. ad Antioch.) We have already seen, (note 3,) that Clement—and also Origen—assigned to the angels the office of watching over provinces and towns, in accordance with the notion of individual guardian-angels; comp. Clem. Strom. v. p. 700, and vii. p. 833, and the passage quoted above from Origen.

(7) Col. ii. 18. mention is made of a θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων which the apostle disapproves. The answer to the question, whether *Justin M.* numbered the angels among the objects of Christian worship, depends upon the interpretation of the passage, Apol. i. 6: Ἄθεοι κεκλήμεθα καὶ ὁμολογοῦμεν τῶν τοιούτων νομιζομένων θεῶν ἄθεοι εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀληθεστάτου καὶ πατρὸς δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν, ἀνεπιμίκτου τε κακίας θεοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνόν τε καὶ τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ υἱὸν ἐλθόντα καὶ διδάξαντα ἡμᾶς ταῦτα καὶ τὸν τῶν ἄλλων ἑπομένων καὶ ἐξομοιουμένων ἀγαθῶν ἀγγέλων στρατὸν, πνεῦμα τε τὸ προφητικὸν σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν, λόγῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ τιμῶντες. The principal point in question is, whether the accusative τὸν τῶν ἄλλων...στρατὸν is governed by σεβόμεθα καὶ προσκυνοῦμεν, or by διδάξαντα. Most modern writers adopt the former interpretation, which is probably the more correct one. Thus *Semisch*, p. 350, ss. *Möhler*, (Patrologie, p. 240.) finds in this passage as well as in Athen. Leg. 10, a proof of the Romish adoration of angels and saints. But Athenagoras (c. 16.) rejects this doctrine very decidedly in the following words: Οὐ τὰς δυνάμεις τοῦ θεοῦ πρασίοντες θεραπεύομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸν ποιητὴν αὐτῶν καὶ δεσπότην. Comp. Clem. Strom. vi. 5, p. 760. Orig. contra Cels. v. 4, 5. Opp. i. p. 580, and viii. 13, ib. p. 751, quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 84, 85. (Comp. *Knapp*, l. c. p. 190. *Gieseler*, i. § 99, and note 33. **Burton*, Testimonies of the Anten. Fath. to the Trinity, etc. p. 15–23. On the Gnostic worship of angels, comp. *Burton*, Bampton Lect. note 52.] In the opinion of *Origen*, the angels rather pray *with* us and *for* us, comp. contra Cels. viii. 64, p. 789. Hom. in Num. xxiv. (Opp. iii. p. 362.)

§ 51.

SATAN AND DEMONS.

The Bible does not represent the prince of darkness, or the wicked one (Devil, Satan) as an evil principle which existed from the beginning, in opposition to a good principle; but, in accordance with the doctrine of One God, it speaks of him as a creature, viz. an angel who was created by God in a state of purity and innocence, but voluntarily rebelled against his maker. This was also the view taken by the orthodox Fathers.(1) Every thing which was opposed to the light of the gospel, and its developement, physical evils,(2) as well as the numerous persecutions of the Christians,(3) was thought to be a work of Satan and his agents, the demons. The entire system of paganism, of mythology, and worship,(4) and, according to some, even philosophy,(5) were supposed to be subject to the influence of demons. Heresies(6) were also ascribed to the same agency. Moreover, some particular vices were considered to be the specific effects of individual evil spirits.(7)

(1) Concerning the appellatives שָׂטָן σατᾶν, σατανᾶς, διάβολος, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, δαιμονες, δαιμόνια, βεελζεβούλ, etc., the origin of the doctrine and its developement in the Scriptures, comp. *de Wette*, biblische Dogmatik, § 145–150; 212–214; 236–238; *Baumgarten-Crusius*, biblische Theologie, p. 295; *Von Cölln*, biblische Theologie, p. 420; *Hirzel*, Commentar. zum Hiob, p. 16; [*Knapp*, l. c. p. 190–203. *Storr* and *Flatt*, biblic. Theol. transl. by Schmucker, sect. 50, 51; *Lawrence, E. A.*, in Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. sub voce.] The Fathers generally adopted the notions already existing. *Justin M.*, Apol. min. c. 5. *Athenag.* leg. 24: Ὡς γὰρ θεόν φαμεν καὶ υἱὸν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ πνεῦμα ἅγιον... οὕτως καὶ ἑτέρας εἶναι δυνάμεις, κατειλήμμεθα περὶ τὴν ὕλην ἐχούσας καὶ δι' αὐτῆς, μίαν μὲν τήν ἀντίθεον, κ. τ. λ. *Iren.* iv. 41, p. 288: Quum igitur a Deo omnia facta sunt et diabolus sibimet ipsi et reli-

quis factus est abscessionis causa, juste scriptura eos, qui in abscessione perseverant, semper filios diaboli et angelos dixit maligni. *Tert.* Apol. c. 22: Atque adeo dicimus, esse substantias quasdam spiritales, nec nomen novum est. Sciunt dæmonas philosophi, Socrate ipso ad dæmonii arbitrium exspectante, quidni? cum et ipso dæmonium adhesisse a pueritia dicatur, dehortatorium plane a bono. Dæmonas sciunt poëtæ, et jam vulgus indoctum in usum maledicti frequentat; nam et Satanam, principem hujus mali generis, proinde de propria conscientia animæ eadem execramenti voce pronunciat; angelos quoque etiam Plato non negavit, utriusque nominis testes esse vel magi adsunt. Sed quomodo de angelis quibusdam sua sponte corruptis corruptior gens dæmonum evaserit damnata a Deo cum generis auctoribus et cum eo quem diximus principe, apud litteras sanctas ordine cognoscitur. Comp. *Orig.* de princ. proœm. 6. Opp. T. i. p. 48; according to him it is sufficient to believe that Satan and the demons really *exist*—quæ autem sint aut quo modo sint, (ecclesia) non clare exposuit. It was not until the following period that the Manichæans developed the dualistic doctrine of an evil principle in the form of a regular system, although traces of it may be found in some earlier Gnostic notions, *e. g.* the Jaldabaoth of the Ophites, comp. *Neander's* gnostische Systeme, p. 233, ss. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 173, ss. [*Neander*, hist. of the Ch. transl. ii. p. 98, ss., comp. *Norton*, l. c. iii. p. 57–62.] In opposition to this dualistic view, Origen maintains that the devil and his angels are creatures of God, though not created *as* devils, but as spiritual beings. Contra Cels. iv. 65. Opp. i. p. 553.

(2) *Tertullian* and *Origen* agree in ascribing failures of crops, drought, famine, pestilence, and murrain to the influence of demons. Tert. Apol. c. 22, (operatio eorum est hominis eversio,) Orig. contra Cels. viii. 31, 32. Opp. i. p. 764, 65. He calls the evil spirits the executioners of God (δήμιοι.) Demoniacal possessions were still considered as a phenomenon of special importance (as in the times of the New Test.) *Minuc Fel.* c. 27: Irrepentes etiam corporibus occulte, ut spiritus tenues, morbos fingunt, terrent mentes, membra distorquent. Concerning these δαιμονιόληπτοι, μαιμόνενοι, ἐνεϱγούμενοι, comp. in particular Const. apost. lib. viii. c. 7. A rationalisticexplanation is given in the Clementine Hom. ix. § 12: "Οθεν πολλοὶ οὐκ εἰδότες πόθεν ἐνεϱγοῦνται, ταῖς τῶν δαιμόνων κακαῖς ὑποβαλλομέναις ἐπινοίαις, ὡς τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν λογισμῷ

συντίθενται Comp., moreover, Orig. ad Matth. xvii. 5. Opp. T. iii. p. 574, ss., de princ. iii. 2. Opp. T. i. p. 138. ss. (de contrariis potestatibus.) *Schnitzer*, p. 198, ss.; *Thomasius*, p. 184, ss., and the passages cited there; [*Knapp*, p. 201; *Denham* in Kitto, l. c. sub. Demonaics.]

(3) *Justin, M.* Apol. c. 5, 12, 14, (quoted by Usteri, l. c. p. 421.) *Minuc. Fel.* l. c.: Ideo inserti mentibus imperitorum odium nostri serunt occulte per timorem. Naturale est enim et odisse quem timeas et quem metueris infestare si possis. Justin M. Apol. ii. towards the commencement, and c. 6. Comp. Orig. exhort. ad Martyr. § 18, 32, 42. Opp. T. i. p. 286, 294, 302. But Justin M. Apol. i. c. 5, ascribes the procedures against Socrates also to the hatred of the demons. The observation of Justin quoted by Irenæus (advers. hær. v. c. 26, p. 324, and Euseb. iv. 18,) is very remarkable: Ὅτι πρὸ μὲν τῆς τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίας οὐδέποτε ἐτόλμησεν ὁ Σατανᾶς βλασφημῆσαί τὸν Θεὸν, ἅτε μηδέπω εἰδὼς αὐτοῦ τὴν κατάκρισιν; (comp. Epiph. in hær. Sethianor. p. 289), thus the efforts of the powers of darkness against the rapidly spreading Christian religion could be explained the more satisfactorily.

(4) Ep. Barn. c. 16, 18. Justin M. Apol. i. 12, and elsewhere; Tatian, c. 12, 20, and elsewhere (comp. *Daniel*, p. 162, ss.;) Athen. leg. c. 26. Tert. Apol. c. 22. Minuc. Fel. Octav. c. 27. 1. Clem. Al. Cohort. p. 7. Origen contra Cels. iii. 28, 37, 69. iv. 36, 92; v. 5; vii. 64; viii. 30. The demons are present in particular at the offering of sacrifices, and sip in the smoke of the burnt offering, they speak out of the oracles, and rejoice in the licentiousness and excess which accompany these festivals. (Comp. *Keil* de angelorum malorum s. dæmoniorum cultu apud gentiles. Opusc. academ. p. 584–601. *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln i. p. 92, ss.

(5) According to Minuc. Fel. c. 26, the demon of Socrates was one of those evil demons. Clement also says of a sect of Christians, Strom. i. 1, p. 326: Οἱ δὲ καὶ πρὸς κακοῦ ἂν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν εἰσδεδυκέναι τὸν βίον νομίζουσιν, ἐπὶ λύμῃ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πρὸς τινος εὑρετοῦ πονηροῦ, which is manifestly nothing but an euphemism for διαβόλου, comp. Strom. vi. 822: Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἄτοπον τὴν ἀταξίαν καὶ τὴν ἀδικίαν προσνέμοντας τῷ διαβόλῳ, ἐναγέτου πράγματος, τοῦτον τῆς φιλοσοφίας, δωτῆρα ποιεῖν; comp. also Strom. i. 17, p. 366, and the note in the edit. of Potter. Astrology, etc. was also ascribed to demoniacal influence.

(6) Comp. Justin M. Apol. i. 56, 58. *Cyprian* de unitatate

ecclesiæ, p. 105: Hæreses invenit (diabolus) et schismata, quibus subverteret fidem, veritatem corrumperet, scinderet unitatem, etc.

(7) Hermas, ii 6, 2, comp. the preceding §. *Justin M.* Apol. ii. c. 5, (Usteri, p. 423.) . . . καὶ εἰς ἀνθρώπους φόνους, πολέμους, μοιχείας, ἀκολασίας καὶ πᾶσαν κακίαν ἔσπειραν. *Clem. of Alex.* designates as the most malicious and most pernicious of all demons the greedy belly-demon (κοιλιοδαίμονα λιχνότατον), who is related to the one who is effective in ventriloquists (τῷ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ.) Pæd. ii. 1, p. 174. *Origen* follows Hermas in classifying the demons according to the vices which they represent, and thus prepares the way for more moderate views, gradually to convert these concrete representations of devils into abstract notions. Comp. Hom. 15. in Jesum Nave Opp. T. ii. p. 434: Unde mihi videtur esse infinitus quidem numerus contrariarum virtutum, pro eo quod per singulos pene homines sunt spiritus aliqui, diversa in iis peccatorum genera molientes. Verbi causa, est aliquis fornicationis spiritus, est iræ spiritus alius, est avaritiæ spiritus, alius vere superbiæ. Et si eveniat esse aliquem hominem, qui his omnibus malis aut etiam pluribus agitetur, omnes hos vel etiam plures in se habere inimicos putandus est spiritus. Comp. also the subsequent part, where it is said not only that every vice has its respective chief demon, but also that every vicious person is possessed with a demon who is in the service of the chief demon. Others refer both moral defects, and physical impulses, as the sexual impulse, to the devil; Origen, however, objects to this notion, de princ. iii. 2, 2. Opp. T. i. p. 139.

§ 52.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The Fathers differed in their opinions respecting the particular sin which caused the apostacy of the demons.(1) Some thought that it was envy and pride,(2) others supposed lasciviousness and intemperance.(3) But it is of practical importance to notice, that the church never held that the devil can compel any soul to commit sin, without its own consent.(4) *Origen* went so far that, contrary to general opinion, he did not even take from Satan all hope of future pardon.(5)

(1) The Fathers did not agree with regard to the time at which this event took place. On the supposition that the devil seduced our first parents, it is necessary to assign an earlier date to his apostacy than to the fall of man. But, according to *Tatian*, Orat. c. 11, the fall of Satan was the punishment which was inflicted upon him in consequence of the part he had taken in the first sin of man (comp. *Daniel*, p. 187 and 196.) From the language of *Irenæus* (comp. note 2.) one might almost suspect that he entertained similar views; but it is more probable that he fixed upon the period which elapsed between the creation of man and his temptation as the time when the devil apostatized. Thus *Cyprian* says, de dono patient. p. 218: Diabolus hominem ad imaginem Dei factum impatienter tulit; inde et periit *primus* et perdidit.

(2) Iren. adv. hær. iv. 40, 3, p. 287: Ἐζήλωσε τὸ πλάσμα τοῦ ϑεοῦ, and Cyprian, l. c. Orig. in Ezech. Hom. 9, 2. Opp. T. iii. p. 389: Inflatio, superbia, arrogantia peccatum diaboli est et ob hæc delicta ad terras migravit de cœlo. Comp. Phot. Bibl. Cod. 324, p. 293, (ed. Bekker): Οἱ μὲν λοιποὶ (ἄγγελοι) ἐφ' ὧν αὐτούς ἐποίησε καὶ διετάξατο ὁ ϑεὸς ἔμειναν· αὐτὸς δὲ (sc. ὁ διάβολος) ἐνύβρισε.

(3) The passage in Gen. vi. 2, (according to the reading οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ ϑεοῦ instead of οἱ υἱοί τοῦ ϑεοῦ) had already been applied to the demons, and their intercourse with the daughters of men, [thus by *Philo*, de gigant. p. 286, C. *Josephus*, Antiq. i. 3. 1.:...for many angels of God..., and the (apocryphal book of Enoch.] (Comp. *Wernsdorf*, Exercitatio de commercio Angelorum cum filiabus hominum ab Judæis et Patribus platonizantibus credito. Viteb. 1742. 4. *Keil*, opusc. p. 566, ss. *Münscher* edit by von. Cölln, p. 89, 90. *Suicer* s. v. ἄγγελος i. p. 36. and ἐγρήγορος p. 1003.) All the Fathers of the first period (with the exception of Julius Africanus, see *Routh*, reliquiæ sacræ ii. p. 127, ss.) referred the passages in question to the sexual intercourse of the angels with the daughters of men. This, however, can refer only to the later demons who became subject to the devil, and not to the apostacy of Satan himself, which falls in an earlier period (note 1.) Concerning the apparent parachronism, comp. *Münscher*, Handb. ii. p. 30, 31. In accordance with this notion, *Clement*, Strom. iii. 7, p. 538, designates the ἀκρασία and ἐπιϑυμία as the causes of the fall.—The before stated views on pagan worship and the temptation to sensuality (§ 51, and ibid, note 7,) were connected with the notions respecting

the intercourse of the demons with the daughters of men. The fallen angels betrayed the mysteries of revelation to them, though in an imperfect and corrupt form, and the heathen have their philosophy from these women. Comp. Clem. Strom. vi. 1. p. 650.

(4) *Hermas*, lib. ii. mand. 7.; Diabolum autem ne timeas, timens enim Dominum, dominaberis illius, quia virtus in illo nulla est. In quo autem virtus non est, is ne timendus quidem est; in quo vero virtus gloriosa est, is etiam timendus est. Omnis enim virtutem habens timendus est: nam qui virtutem non habet, ab omnibus contemnitur. Time plane facta Diaboli, quoniam maligna sunt: metuens enim Dominum, timebis, et opera Diaboli non facies, sed abstinebis te ab eis. Comp. 12. 5: Potest autem Diabolus luctari, sed vincere non potest. Si enim resistitur, fugiet a vobis confusus.—[For as a man, when he fills up vessels with good wine, and among them puts a few vessels half full, and comes to try and taste of the vessels, does not try those that are full, because he knows that they are good; but tastes those that are half full, lest they should grow sour: so the devil comes to the servants of God to try them. They that are full of faith resist him stoutly, and he departs from them, because he finds no place where to enter into them: then he goes to those that are not full of faith, and because he has a place of entrance, he goes into them, and does what he will with them, and they become his servants. Hermas, 12. 5, Archbp. *Wake's* transl.] Comp. *Tatian*, c. 16: *Δαίμονες δὲ οἱ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπιτάττοντες, οὐκ εἰσιν αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχαί κ. τ. λ.* Iren. ii. c. 32. 4, p. 166. *Tert.* Apol. c. 23: [Omnis hæc nostra in illos dominatio et potestas de nominatione Christi valet, et de commemoratione eorum quæ sibi a Deo per arbitrum Christum imminentia exspectant. Christum timentes in Deo, et Deum in Christo, subjiciuntur servis Dei et Christi.] *Orig.* de princ. iii. 2, 4, contra Cels. i. 6. and viii. 36. Opp. i. p. 769: *Ἀλλ' οὐ χριστιανὸς, ὁ ἀληθῶς χριστιανὸς καὶ ὑποτάξας ἑαυτὸν μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ πάθοι τι ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν δαιμονίων, ἅτε κρείττων δαιμόνων τυγχάνων*, and in libr. Jesu Nave xv. 6. In the former passage de princ. Origen calls those weak (simpliciores) who believe that sin would not exist, if no devil existed.—Along with the moral power of faith, and the efficacy of prayer, the magic effects of the sign of the cross, etc. were relied on. But what was at first nothing

more than a symbol of the power of faith itself, became afterwards a mechanical opus operatum.

(5) Even *Clement*, Strom. i. 17. p. 367, says: Ὁ δὲ διάβολος αὐτεξούσιος ὢν καὶ μετανοῆσαι οἷός τε ἦν καὶ κλέψαι καὶ ὁ αἴτιος αὐτὸς τῆς κλοπῆς, οὐχ ὁ μὴ κωλύσας κύριος, but from these words it is not quite evident, whether he means to say that the devil is yet capable of being converted. The general opinion on this point is expressed in the following passage, *Tatian*, Orat. c. 15.: Ἡ τῶν δαιμόνων ὑπόστασις οὐκ ἔχει μετανοίας τόπον. Comp. also *Justin, M.* dialog. c. Tryph. c. 141.—*Origen* himself did not very clearly propound his views. De princ. iii. c. 6. 5. Opp. i. p. 154: [Propterea etiam novissimus inimicus, qui mors appellatur, destrui dicitur (1 Cor. xv. 26,) ut neque ultra triste sit aliquid ubi mors non est, neque adversum sit ubi non est inimicus. Destrui sane novissimus inimicus ita intelligendus est, non ut substantia ejus, quæ a Deo facta est, pereat, sed ut propositum et voluntas inimica, quæ non a Deo sed ab ipso processit, intereat. Destruetur ergo non ut non sit, sed ut inimicus non sit et mors. Nihil enim omnipotenti impossibile est, nec insanabile est aliquid factori suo. § 6. *Omnia restituentur ut unum sint, et Deus fuerit omnia in omnibus.* (1 Cor. xv. 28.) Quod tamen non ad subitum fieri, sed paulatim et per partes intelligendum est, infinitis et immensis labentibus sæculis, cum sensim et per singulos emendatio fuerit et correctio prosecuta, præcurrentibus aliis et velociori cursu ad summa tendentibus, *aliis* vero proximo quoque spatio insequentibus, tum deinde aliis longe posterius: et sic per multos et innumeros ordines proficientium ac Deo se ex inimicis reconciliantium pervenitur usque ad novissimum inimicum qui dicitur mors, et etiam ipse destruatur ne ultra sit inimicus.] He there speaks of the last enemy, death, but it is evident from the context, that he identifies death with the devil; he speaks of a substance which the Creator would not destroy, but heal. *Thomasius*, p. 187. On the possibility of the conversion of the other demons, comp. i. 6. 3. Opp. i. p. 70: Jam vero si aliqui ex his ordinibus, qui sub principatu diaboli agunt, ac malitiæ ejus obtemperant, poterunt aliquando in futuris sæculis converti ad bonitatem, pro eo quod est in ipsis liberi facultas arbitrii?...

THIRD SECTION.

ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 53.

INTRODUCTION.

The material design of Christianity, and the essential condition of all further developement, is to turn the attention of man to himself, and to bring him to the knowledge of his own nature.(1) On this account the first object of Christian anthropology should be to determine, not what man is in respect to his natural life, and his relation to the surrounding visible creation, but rather, what he is in respect to his spiritual and moral condition, and his relation to God and Divine things. But since the higher and spiritual nature of man is intimately connected with the organism of body and soul, it was necessary that a system of *theological* anthropology should be constructed on the basis of physical and psychical anthropology, which forms a part of natural philosophy, and philosophy, properly speaking, rather than of theology. The history of doctrines, therefore, must also consider the opinions relative to the natural relations of man.(2)

(1) Comp. Clem. Pæd. iii. i. p. 250: Ἦν ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικε, πάντων μεγίστων μαθημάτων τὸ γνῶναι αὑτόν· ἑαυτὸν γάρ τις ἐὰν γνῷη, θεὸν εἴσεται.

(2) At first sight it might appear indifferent in regard to theology, whether man consists of two or three parts, yet this distinction was intimately connected with the theological defini-

tions of liberty, immortality, etc. This is the case also with the doctrine of pre-existence, in opposition to Traducianism and Creationism relative to original sin, etc. Thus it can be explained why *Tatian*, on religious grounds, opposes the common definition, according to which man is a ζῶον λογικόν, contra Græcos, c. 15: Ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος, οὐκ ὥσπερ κορακόφωνοι δογματίζουσιν, ζῶον λογικὸν, νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικόν· δεικθήσεται γὰρ κατ' αὐτους καὶ τὰ ἄλογα νοῦ καὶ ἐπιστήμης δεκτικα. Μόνος δὲ ἄνθρωπος εἰκὼν καὶ ὁμοίωσις τοῦ θεοῦ, λέγω δὲ ἄνθρώπον οὐχὶ τὸν ὅμοια τοῖς ζώοις πράττοντα, ἀλλὰ τὸν πόῤῥω μὲν ἀνθρωπότητος, πρὸς αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν θεὸν κεχωρηκίτα.

§ 54.

DIVISION OF MAN AND PRACTICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

Keil, Opusc. Academ. p. 618—647.

That man is composed of body and soul, is a fact of which we are conscious by experience previous to all speculation, and before we endeavour to express it by a precise, scientific term. But it is more difficult to define the relation between body and soul, and to assign to either its particular sphere. Some regarded the ψυχή as the medium by which the purely spiritual in man, the higher and ideal principle of reason, is connected with the purely animal, the grosser and sensual principle of his carnal nature. They also imagined that this notion of a human trias was supported by the language of Scripture.(1) Some of the earlier Fathers,(2) and those of the Alexandrian school in particular,(3) adopted this trichotomistic division, while *Tertullian* adhered to the old opinion, according to which man consists of body and soul only.(4) Some of the Gnostic sects, *e. g.* the Valentinians, so perverted the trichotomistic division, as to divide men themselves into three classes, the χοϊκοί, ψυχικοί, and πνευματικοί, according as one or the other of the three constituents preponderated, or prevailed to the apparent exclusion of the others. Thus they destroyed the bond of union with which Christ had encirled men as brethren.(5)

(1) רוּחַ נֶפֶשׁ בָּשָׂר, σάρξ, ψυχή, πνεῦμα. Comp. the works on bibl. theol., and the commentaries on 1 Thess. v. 23; Heb. iv. 12, etc. also *Ackermann*, Studien und Kritiken, 1839. part 4.

(2) *Justin M.* fragm. de resurr. § 10: Οἶκος τὸ σῶμα ψυχῆς, πνεύματος δὲ ψυχὴ οἶκος. Τὰ τρία ταῦτα τοῖς ἐλπίδα εἰλικρινῆ καὶ πίστιν ἀδιάκριτον ἐν τῷ Θεῷ ἔχουσι σωθήσεται. Comp. Dial. cum Tryph. § 4. *Tatian* contra Græc. or. c. 7. 12. 15. *Irenæus*, v. 9. 1.: Tria sunt, ex quibus perfectus homo constat, carne, anima et spiritu, et altero quidem salvante et figurante, qui est spiritus, altero, quod unitur et formatur, quod est caro; id vero quod inter hæc est duo, quod est anima, quæ aliquando quidem subsequens spiritum elevatur ab eo, aliquando autem consentiens carni decidit in terrenas concupiscentias. Comp. v. 6. 1, p. 299: Anima autem et spiritus pars hominum esse possunt, homo autem nequaquam: perfectus autem homo commixtio et adunitio est animæ assumentis spiritum Patris et admixta ei carni, quæ est plasmata secundum imaginem Dei. Accordingly, it is not every man who is composed of three parts, but he only who has received the gift of the Holy Spirit, as the third part. Concerning the distinction between Pnoë and Pneuma, comp. § 44, and *Dunker*, p. 97, 98.

(3) *Clement* (Strom. vii. 12, p. 880), makes a distinction between the ψυχὴ λογική and the ψυχὴ σωματική; he also mentions a *tenfold* division of man (analogous to the decalogue,) ibid. vi. 16. p. 808: Ἔστι δὲ καὶ δεκάς τις περὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον αὐτὸν, τά τε αἰσθητήρια πέντε καὶ τὸ φωνητικὸν καὶ τὸ σπερματικόν· καὶ τοῦτο δὴ ὄγδοον τὸ κατὰ τὴν πλάσιν πνευματικόν· ἔννατον δὲ τὸ ἡγεμονικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς· καὶ δέκατον τὸ διὰ τῆς πίστεως προσγινόμενον ἁγίου πνεύματος χαρακτηριστικὸν ἰδίωμα κ. τ. λ. The more general division into body, soul, and spirit, forms however the basis of this one. Clement, after the example of Plato, (comp. Justin M. Coh. ad Gr. 6.), divides the soul itself into these three faculties: τὸ λογιστικόν (νοερόν), τὸ θυμικόν, τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν, Pæd. iii. 1, ab init. p. 250. The faculty of perception is subdivided into four different functions: αἴσθησις, νοῦς, ἐπιστήμη, ὑπόληψις, Strom. ii. 4. p. 435. Clement regards body and soul as διάφορα, but not as ἐναντία, so that neither the soul is good as such, nor the body is evil as such. Comp. Strom. iv. 26, p. 639. For the psychology of *Origen*, comp. de princ. iii. 3. Opp. i. p. 145. (*Redepenn.* p. 296—306.) On the question, whether Origen did indeed believe in the existence of two souls in man? see *Schnitzer*, p. 219, ss. *Thomasius*, p. 190, 193–195.

In the view of Origen the ψυχή as such, which he derives from ψύχεσθαι, holds the medium between body and spirit. He affirms to have met with no passage in the Sacred Scriptures, in which the soul, as such, is favourably spoken of, while, on the contrary, it is frequently condemned, de princ. ii. 8. 3 –5. Opp. i. p. 95, ss. (*Redep.* p. 211, ss.) But this does not prevent him from comparing the soul to the Son, when he draws a comparison between the human and the Divine trias, ibid. § 5.—For the trichotomistic division, comp. also Comment. in Matth. T. xiii. 2. Opp. iii. p. 570, and other passages in *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 319, 320. Origen sometimes employs the simple term " man" to designate his higher spiritual nature, so that man appears not so much to consist of body and soul, as to be the soul itself which governs the body as a mere instrument, contra Cels. vii. 38 : Ἄνθρωπος, τουτέστι ψυχὴ χρωμένη σώματι (comp. Photius Cod. 234. Epiph. hær. 64. 17.) Consequently he calls the soul homo homo = homo interior, in Num. xxiv. comp. *Thomasius*, l. c.

(4) De anima c. 10, 11, 20, 21, 22 : Anima *dei flatu* nata, immortalis, *corporalis*, effigiata, *substantia simplex*, de suo patiens varie procedens, libera arbitrii, accidentiis obnoxia, per ingenia mutabilis, rationalis, dominatrix, divinatrix, ea una redundans. adv. Hermog. c. 11. and *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 457. Concerning the importance which, from his practical position, he attached to the senses (the key to his theological opinions) comp. ibid. p. 452, ss.

(5) Iren. i. 5. 5. comp. also *Neander's* gnostische Systeme, p. 127, ss. *Baur*, Gnosis, 158, ss., 168, ss., 489, ss., 679, ss. *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 316. 17.

§ 55.

ORIGIN OF THE SOUL.

The inquiry into the origin of the human soul, and the mode of its union to the body, seems to belong solely to metaphysics, and to have no bearing whatever upon religion.(1) But, in a religious point of view, it is always of importance, that the soul should be considered *as a being which has derived its existence from God.* This doctrine was maintained by the catholic church in opposition to the Gnostic theory of emanations,(2) to which the opinion of *Origen* concerning the *pre-existence of the soul* is closely allied.(3) On the contrary, *Tertullian* asserted the propagation of the soul per traducem in accordance with his realistico-material conceptions of its corporeity, (*Traducianism.*)(4)

(1) Accordingly *Origen* says de princ. prœm. 5. Opp. i. p. 48: De anima vero utrum ex seminis traduce ducatur, ita ut ratio ipsius vel substantia inserta ipsis seminibus corporalibus habeatur, an vero aliud habeat initium, et hoc ipsum initium si genitum est aut non genitum, vel certe si extrinsecus corpori inditur, necne: non satis manifesta prædicatione distinguitur.

(2) Traces of the theory of emanation are found in the writings of some of the earlier Fathers. *Justin M.*, fragm. de resurr. 11: Ἡ *μὲν ψυχή ἐστιν ἄφθαρτος, μέρος οὖσα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐμφύσημα.* Comp. the Clementine Homilies, Hom. xvi. 12. On the other hand, *Clement of Alex.* adheres to the idea of a *created being*, Coh. p. 78: *Μόνος ὁ τῶν ὅλων δημιουργὸς ὁ ἀριστοτέχνας πατὴρ τοιοῦτον ἄγαλμα ἔμψυχον ἡμᾶς, τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἔπλασεν*, and Strom. ii. 16, p. 467, 468, where he rejects the phrase *μέρος Θεοῦ*, which some have employed, in accordance with the principle: *Θεὸς οὐδεμίαν ἔχει πρὸς ἡμᾶς φυσικὴν σχέσιν.* Comp. *Orig.* in Joh. T. xiii. 25. Opp. T. iv. p. 235: *Σφόδρα ἐστὶν ἀσεβὲς ὁμοούσιον τῇ ἀγεννήτῳ φύσει καὶ παμμακαρίᾳ εἶναι λέγειν τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας ἐν πνεύματι τῷ Θεῷ.* Comp. de princ. i. 7. 1.

(3) *Clemens*, Coh. p. 6: *Πρὸ δὲ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου καταβολῆς ἡμεῖς οἱ τῷ δεῖν ἔσεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ πρότερον γεγεννημένοι τῷ Θεῷ· τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου τὰ λογικὰ πλάσματα ἡμεῖς· δι' ὃν ἀρχαΐζομεν, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ λόγος ἦν*; this perhaps should rather be understood in an ideal sense. But *Origen*, following the example of the Pythagoræan and Platonic schools as well as of the later Jewish theology, speaks of the pre-existence of the soul as something real (Comp. Epiph. hær. 64, 4: *Τὴν ψυχὴν γὰρ τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν λέγει προϋπάρχειν.*) He reconciles his doctrine with human liberty and Divine justice by maintaining that the soul entering into the bodies of men suffers punishment for former sins. Comp. de princ. i. 7, 4. Opp. i. p. 72. (*Redep.* p. 151. *Schnitzer*, p. 72.)—"If the origin of the human soul were coeval with that of the body, how could it happen that Jacob supplanted his brother in the womb, and John leaped in the

womb at the salutation of Mary?" etc. Comp. also T. xv. in Matth. c. 34, 35, in Matth. xx. 6, 7. Opp. T. iii. p. 703, and Comment. in Joh. T. ii. 25. Opp. iv. p. 85.

(4) De anima, c. 19: Et si ad arbores provocamur, amplectemur exemplum. Si quidem et illis, necdum arbusculis, sed stipitibus adhuc et surculis etiam nunc, simul de scrobibus oriuntur, inest propria vis animæ . . . . quo magis hominis? cujus anima, velut surculus quidam ex matrice Adam in propaginem deducta et genitalibus feminæ foveis commendata cum omni sua paratura, pullulabit tam intellectu quam sensu? Mentior, si non statim infans ut vitam vagitu salutavit, hoc ipsum se testatur sensisse atque intellexisse, quod natus est, omnes simul ibidem dedicans sensus, et luce visum et sono auditum et humore gustum et aëre odoratum et terra tactum. Ita prima illa vox de primis sensuum et de primis intellectuum pulsibus cogitur. . . . . . Et hic itaque concludimus, omnia naturalia animæ, ut substantiva ejus, ipsi inesse et cum ipsa procedere atque proficere, ex quo ipsa censetur, sicut et Seneca sæpe noster (de benef. iv. 6): Insita sunt nobis omnium artium et ætatum semina, etc. Comp. c. 27. *Neander*, Antignost. p. 455.

§ 56.

THE IMAGE OF GOD.

Both the excellencies of the body, and the higher moral and religious nature of man, which were frequently pointed out by the Fathers,(1) are beautifully and appropriately described in the simple words of Scripture (Gen. i. 27.) " So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." This expression continued to be employed by the church.(2) But it was a point of no little difficulty precisely to determine in what the image of God consists. As body and soul could not absolutely be separated, the notion arose that even the body of man is created after the image of God,(3) and this was held by some in a more literal, by others in a more figurative sense, while some again rejected it altogether. All parties, however, admitted as a matter of course, that the image of God has a special reference to the spiritual faculties of man. But, inasmuch as there is a great difference between the mere natural dispositions, and their developement by the free use of the powers which have been granted to men, several writers, among whom *Irenæus*, and especially *Clement* and *Origen*, distinguished between the image of God, and resemblance to God. The latter can only be obtained by a mental conflict (in an ethical point of view,) or is bestowed upon man as a gift of sovereign mercy by union with Christ (in a religious aspect.)(4)

(1) *Iren.* iv. 29, p. 285 : Ἔδει δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον πρῶτον γενέσθαι, καὶ γενόμενον αὐξῆσαι, καὶ αὐξήσαντα ἀνδρωθῆναι, καὶ ἀνδρωθέντα πληθυνθῆναι, καὶ πληθυνθέντα ἐνισχῦσαι, καὶ ἐνισχύσαντα δοξασθῆν, καὶ δοξασθέντα ἰδειν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ δεσπότην. *Min. Fel.* 17 and 18 ab init. *Tatian*, Or. Contra Gr. c. 12 and 19, *Clem.* Coh. p. 78. According to the latter, man is the most beautiful hymn to the praise of the Deity, p. 78, a heavenly plant (φύτον οὐράνιον) p. 80, and, generally speaking, the principal object of the love of God, Pæd. i. 3, p. 102. Comp. p. 158. Pæd. iii. 7, p. 276 : Φύσει γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὑψηλόν ἐστι ζῶον καὶ γαῦρον καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ζητητικόν, ib. iii. 8, p. 292. But all the good he possesses is not innate in such a manner as that it ought not to be developed by instruction (μάθησις.) Comp. Strom. i. 6, p. 336 ; iv. 23, p. 632 ; vi. 11, p. 788 ; vii. 4, p. 839, and the passages on human liberty, which will be found below.

(2) Some of the Alexandrian theologians, however, wishing to speak more accurately, taught that man had been created not so much after the image of *God* himself, as after the image of the *Logos*, an image after an image! Coh. p. 78 : Ἡ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰκὼν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, καὶ υἱὸς τοῦ νοῦ γνήσιος ὁ θεῖος λόγος, φωτὸς ἀρχέτυπον φῶς· εἰκὼν δὲ τοῦ λόγου ὁ ἄνθρωπος· ἀληθινὸς ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν διὰ τοῦτο γεγενῆσθαι λεγόμενος, τῇ κατὰ καρδίαν φρονήσει τῷ θείῳ παρεικαζόμενος λόγῳ, καὶ ταύτῃ λογικός. Comp. Strom. v. 14, p. 703, and Orig. Comment. in Joh. p. 941. Opp. T. iv. p. 19, 51, in Luc. hom. viii. Opp. T. iii.

(3) This idea was connected with another, according to which God was supposed to possess a body (see above) or with the notion that the body of Christ had been the image after which the body of man had been created. (The author of the Clementine

Homilies also thought that *the body in particular* bore the image of God, comp. *Piper* on Melito, l. c. p. 74, 75.) *Tert.* de carne Christi, c. 6, adv. Marc. v. 8, adv. Prax. 12. *Neander*, Antign. p. 407, ss. The more spiritual view was, that the life of the soul, partaking of the Divine nature, shines through the physical organism, and is reflected especially on the countenance of man, in his looks, etc. *Tatian*, Or. c. 15, (*Worth*, c. 24): Ψυχὴ μὲν οὖν ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πολυμερής ἐστι καὶ οὐ μονομερής. Συνθετὴ (al. συνετὴ according to Fronto Ducæus, comp. *Daniel*, p. 202) γάρ ἐστιν ὡς εἶναι φανερὰν αὐτὴν διὰ σώματος, οὔτε γὰρ ἂν αὐτὴ φανείη ποτὲ χωρὶς σώματος οὔτε ἀνίσταται ἡ σὰρξ χωρὶς ψυχῆς. *Clem.* Coh. p. 52. Strom. v. 14, p. 703: Ψυχὴν δὲ τὴν λογικὴν ἄνωθεν ἐμπνευσθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς πρόσωπον. On this account the Fathers of the Alexandrian school very decidedly oppose the material conception of a bodily copy of the Divine image. Clem. Strom. ii. 19, p. 483: Τὸ γὰρ κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ ὁμοίωσιν, ὡς καὶ πρόσθεν εἰρήκαμεν, οὐ τὸ κατὰ σῶμα μηνύεται· οὐ γὰρ θέμις θνητὸν ἀθανάτῳ ἐξομοιοῦσθαι· ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ νοῦν καὶ λογισμόν. On the other hand, it is indeed remarkable that the same Clement, Pæd. ii. 10, p. 220, should recognize the image of God in the procreative power of man, which others connect with the existence of evil spirits (§ 51): Εἰκὼν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ γίνεται, καθὸ εἰς γένεσιν ἀνθρώπου ἄνθρωπος συνεργεῖ. *Origen* refers the Divine image exclusively to the spirit of man, c. Cels. vi. Opp. i. p. 680, and Hom. i. in Genes. Opp. T. ii. p. 57.

(4) The tautological phrase, Gen. i. 26: בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כִּדְמוּתֵנוּ induced the Fathers to make an arbitrary distinction between צֶלֶם (εἰκών) and דְּמוּת (ὁμοίωσις.) comp. *Schott*, Opuscul. T. ii. p. 66, ss. *Irenæus* adv. Hær. v. 6, p. 299. v. 16, p. 313: Ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν χρόνοις ἐλέγετο μὲν κατ' εἰκόνα Θεοῦ γεγονέναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, οὐκ ἐδείκνυτο δέ· ἔτι γὰρ ἀόρατος ἦν ὁ λόγος, οὗ κατ' εἰκόνα ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐγεγόνει. Διὰ τοῦτο δὴ καὶ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν ῥᾳδίως ἀπέβαλεν. Ὁπότε δὲ σὰρξ ἐγένετο ὁ λόγος, τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἀμφότερα ἐπεκύρωσε· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα ἔδειξεν ἀληθῶς, αὐτὸς τοῦτο γενόμενος ὅπερ ἦν ἡ εἰκὼν αὐτοῦ· καὶ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν βεβαίως κατέστησε συνεξομοιώσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ ἀοράτῳ πατρί. According to some the language of *Clem.* Strom. ii. p. 499, (418, Sylb.) implies that the image of God is communicated to man εὐθέως κατὰ τήν γένεσιν, and that he obtains the resemblance ὕστερον κατὰ τὴν τελείωσιν. According to *Tert.* de bapt. c. 5, man attains unto resemblance to God by *baptism*. According to *Origen*, who everywhere insists upon the spontaneity of man, the resemblance of God which is to be

obtained, consists in this, ut (homo) ipse sibi eam propriæ industriæ studiis ex Dei imitatione consisceret, cum possibilitate sibi perfectionis in initiis data per imaginis dignitatem in fine demum per operum expletionem perfectam sibi ipse similitudinem consummaret, de princ. iii. 6, 1. Opp. T. 1, p. 152. (*Red.* p. 317. *Schnitzer*, p. 236.) Comp. contra Cels. iv. 20, p. 522, 23. But Origen also uses both terms without making any perceptible distinction, Hom. ii. in Jer. Opp. T. iii. p. 137.

§ 57.

LIBERTY AND IMMORTALITY.

a. Liberty.

Liberty and immortality are those qualities of the human mind in which the image of God manifests itself. This was the doctrine of the primitive church, which is confirmed by the consciousness of every Christian. All the Greek Fathers, the apologists *Justin,*(1) *Tatian,*(2) *Athenagoras,*(3) *Theophilus,*(4) and the Latin Father *Minucius Felix,*(5) as well as the theologians of the Alexandrian school, *Clement*(6) and *Origen,*(7) represent the αὐτεξούσιον of the human soul with all the early warmth and freshness of hellenistic idealism, and know nothing of imputation of sin apart from voluntary self-determination. Even *Irenæus*(8) and *Tertullian,*(9) although the former was opposed to speculation, and the latter possessed an austere disposition, strongly assert this liberty from a practico-moral point of view. None but heretics ventured to maintain that man is subject to the influence of a foreign power (the stars, or the εἱμαρμένη.)(10) But it was on this very account that they met with decided opposition on the part of the whole church.

---

(1) *Justin M.* Apol. i. c. 43 : Εἱμαρμένην φαμὲν ἀπαράβατον ταύτην εἶναι, τοῖς τὰ καλὰ ἐκλεγομένοις τὰ ἄξια ἐπιτίμια, καὶ τοῖς ὁμοίως τὰ ἐναντία, τὰ ἄξια ἐπίχειρα. Οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ τὰ ἄλλα, οἷον δένδρα καὶ τετράποδα μηδεν δυνάμενα προαιρέσει πράττειν, ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν ἄξιος ἀμοι-

βῆς ἢ ἐπαίνου, οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ἑλόμενος τὸ ἀγαθὸν, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο γενόμενος, οὐδ' εἰ κακὸς ὑπῆρχε, δικαίως κολάσεως ἐτύγχανεν, οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ τοιοῦτος ὤν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν δυνάμενος εἶναι ἕπερον παρ' ὃ ἐγεγόνει.

(2) *Tatian*, Or. c. 7 : Τὸ δὲ ἑκάτερον τῆς ποιήσεως εἶδος αὐτεξούσιον γέγονε, τἀγαθοῦ φύσιν μὴ ἔχον, ὃ πλὴν [πάλιν] μόνον παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, τῇ δὲ ἐλευθερίᾳ τῆς προαιρέσεως ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκτελειούμενον· ὅπως ὁ μὲν φαῦλος δικαίως κολάζηται, δι' αὐτὸν γεγονὼς μοχθηρός· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος χάριν τῶν ἀνδραγαθημάτων ἀξίως ἐπαινῆται κατὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον τοῦ Θεοῦ μὴ παραβάς τὸ βούλημα. Concerning the critical and exegetical difficulties connected with this passage, see *Daniel*, Tatian der Apologet. p. 207.

(3) Athen. leg. 31. comp. de resurr. 12, 13, 15, 18, ss.

(4) Ad Autol. ii. 27 : Ἐλεύθερον γὰρ καὶ αὐτεξούσιον ἐπυίησεν ὁ θεὸς ἄνθρωπον, in connection with the doctrine of immortality, of which in the next §.

(5) Octav. c. 36, 37. : Nec de fato quisquam aut solatium captet aut excuset eventum. Sit sortis fortuna, mens tamen libera est, et ideo actus hominis, non dignitas judicatur......Ita in nobis non genitura plectitur, sed ingenii natura punitur. The liberty of man gets the victory in the contest with all the adversities of destiny : Vires denique et mentis et corporis sine laboris exercitatione torpescunt ; omnes adeo vestri viri fortes, quos in exemplum prædicatis, ærumnis suis inclyti floruerunt. Itaque et nobis Deus nec non potest subvenire, nec despicit, quum sit et omnium rector et amator suorum ; sed in adversis unumquemque explorat et examinat ; ingenium singulorum periculis pensitat, usque ad extremam mortem voluntatem hominis sciscitatur, nihil sibi posse perire securus. Itaque ut aurum ignibus, sic nos discriminibus arguimur. Quam pulcrum spectaculum Deo, quum Christianus cum dolore congreditur, quum adversum minas et supplicia et tormenta componitur ! quum strepitum mortis et horrorem carnificis irridens insultat ! quum libertatem suam adversus reges et principes erigit, soli Deo, cuius est, cedit, etc ! Nevertheless Minucius xi. 6, intimates (but as an opinion coming from his opponent.) that the Christians believed, that God judges man not so much according to his conduct, as according to his own eternal decrees. But he refutes this view as erroneous.

(6) *Clem.* Coh. p. 79 : Ὑμῶν ἐστιν (ἡ βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν) ἐὰν θελήσητε, τῶν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐσχηκότων. He then shows (p. 80), how man himself, and in accordance with his own nature, ought to cultivate the talents which God has given him. As the horse is not expected to plough (after the custom of the ancients),

nor the ox to serve for the purpose of riding, but as none is required to do more than his nature will allow him to do, so man can only be expected to strive after holiness, because he received the power of doing it. According to Clement man is accountable for *that sin* alone, which proceeds from free choice, Strom. ii. p. 461; it is also frequently in our power to acquire both discernment and strength, ibid. p. 462. Clement knows nothing of a gratia irresistibilis, Strom. viii. p. 855: Οὔτε μὴν ἄκων σωθήσεται ὁ σωζόμενος· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἄψυχος· ἀλλὰ παντὸς μᾶλλον ἑκουσίως καὶ προαιρετικῶς σπεύσει πρὸς σωτηρίαν· διὸ καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς ἔλαβεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὡς ἂν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὁρμητικὸς πρὸς ὁπότερον ἂν καὶ βούλοιτο τῶν τε αἱρετῶν καὶ τῶν φευκτῶν κ. τ. λ.

(7) Comp. the whole of the third book of the work de princip. According to *Origen* there is no accountability without liberty, de princ. ii. 5. Red. p. 188: "If men were corrupt *by nature*, and could not possibly do good, God would appear as the judge not of *actions*, but of *natural faculties*;" (comp. what Minucius says on this point.) Comp. de princ. i. 5. 3. and contra Cels. iv. 3. Opp. i. p. 504: Ἀρετῆς μὲν ἐὰν ἀνέλῃς τὸ ἑκούσιον, ἀνεῖλες αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν. Nevertheless, this liberty is only relative; every moral action has its origin not only in the free choice of man, but also in Divine assistance. Comp. § 70 and the passages quoted by *Redepenning*, Orig. ii. p. 318.

(8) Iren. iv. 4, p. 231, 32, (Gr. 281): Sed frumentum quidem et paleæ, inanimalia et irrationabilia existentia, naturaliter talia facta sunt: homo vero rationabilis et secundum hoc similis Deo, liber in arbitrio factus et suæ potestatis ipse sibi causa est, ut aliquando quidem frumentum, aliquando autem palea fiat; Irenæus founds also the accountability of man upon this argument. Comp. iv. 15, p. 245. (Gr. 318.) iv. 37, p. 281, 82, (Gr. 374, 75): Εἰ φύσει οἱ μὲν φαῦλοι, οἱ δὲ ἀγαθοὶ γεγόνασιν, οὔθ' οὗτοι ἐπαινετοὶ, ὄντες ἀγαθοὶ, τοιοῦτοι γὰρ κατεσκευάσθησαν· οὔτ' ἐκεῖνοι μεμπτοὶ, οὕτως γεγονότες. Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ οἱ πάντες τῆς αὐτῆς εἰσι φύσεως, δυνάμενοί τε κατασχεῖν καὶ πρᾶξαι τὸ ἀγαθὸν, καὶ δυνάμενοι πάλιν ἀποβαλεῖν αὐτὸ καὶ μὴ ποιῆσαι· δικαίως καὶ παρ' ἀνθρώποις τοῖς εὐνομουμένοις, καὶ πολὺ πρότερον παρὰ Θεῷ οἱ μὲν ἐπαινοῦνται, καὶ ἀξίας τυγχάνουσι μαρτυρίας τῆς τοῦ καλοῦ καθόλου ἐκλογῆς καὶ ἐπιμονῆς· οἱ δὲ καταιτιῶνται καὶ ἀξίας τυγχάνουσι ζημίας τῆς τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ ἀγαθυῦ ἀποβολῆς. Comp. also iv. 39, p. 285. (Gr. 380.) v. 27, p. 325. (Gr. 442.) But according to Irenæus the freedom of man is not only seen in his works, but also in his faith, iv. 37, p. 282. (Gr. 376 below), comp. also the fragment of the sermon de fide, p. 342. (Gr. 467.)

(9) Tertullian defended the idea of liberty especially in opposition to Marcion: " How could man, who was destined to rule over the whole creation, be a slave in respect to himself, not having obtained the faculty of reigning over himself?" Advers. Marcion, ii. 8, 6, 9. comp. *Neander*, Antignost. p. 372–373.[a]

(10) "*According to the Gnostics there is a fate which stands in intimate connection with the stars, and is brought about by their instrumentality," etc.* Baur, Gnosis, p. 232. But the doctrine of human freedom is of importance in the opinion of the author of the Clementine Homilies, *e. g.* Hom. xv. 7: Ἕκαστον δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐλεύθερον ἐποίησεν ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἑαυτὸν ἀπομέμειν ᾧ βούλεται, ἢ τῷ παρόντι κακῷ, ἢ τῷ μέλλοντι ἀγαθῷ, comp. also c. 8. Hom. ii. 15; iii. 69; viii. 16; xi. 8. *Credner*, l. c. iii. p. 283, 290, 294. *Schliemann*, p. 182, ss., 235, ss.

§ 58.

b IMMORTALITY.

* *Olshausen*, antiquissimorum ecclesiæ græcæ patrum de immortalitate sententiæ recensentur, Osterprogramm. 1827, reviewed by *Ullmann* in Studien und Kritiken, i. 2. p. 425. [Comp. *Knapp*, l. c. p. 460.]

The theologians of the primitive age did not so completely agree concerning the immortality of the soul. They were far from denying the doctrine itself, or entertaining any doubts respecting the possibility of the thing. But some of them, *e. g. Justin, Tatian,* and *Theophilus* (1) from various reasons, supposed the existence of a soul which, though mortal in itself, or at least indifferent in relation to mortality or immortality, either acquires immortality, as a promised reward, by its union with the spirit and the right use of its liberty, or, in the opposite case, perishes together with the body. They laid great stress upon the liberty of man, by means of which resemblance to God was alone to be obtained. They farther imagined (in accordance with the threefold division) that the soul receives the seeds of immortal life only by becoming connected with the spirit, as the higher and less trammelled life of reason. And, lastly, they may have been induced by other philosophical hypotheses concerning the nature of the soul, to adopt the aforesaid notion. On the contrary, *Tertullian* and *Origen,* whose views differed on other subjects, agreed in this one point, that they, in accordance with their peculiar notions concerning the nature of the soul, looked upon its immortality as essential to it.(2)

---

[a] Even the opponents of the doctrine of human liberty are compelled to acknowledge this remarkable consensus Patrum of the first period, such as *Calvin*, but in order to account for it, they are obliged to suppose a general misapprehension of this doctrine! "*On this account we must always consider it a remarkable phenomenon that the very doctrines which afterwards caused disruptions in the Christian church, are scarcely ever mentioned in the primitive church.*" *Daniel*, Tatian, p. 200.

(1) On the question whether the view advocated by the aged man in *Justin,* dial. c. Tryph. § 4, is the opinion of the author himself, or not?—as well as on the meaning of the passage: Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ ἀποθνήσκειν φημὶ πάσας τὰς ψυχὰς ἐγώ, comp. the commentaries, *Olshausen,* l. c., *Rössler,* Bibl. i. p. 141. *Möhler,* Patrologie, i. p. 242, and *Daniels,* Tatian, p. 224. *Tatian* speaks more distinctly contra Græc. c. 13; Οὔκ ἐστιν ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ καθ' ἑαυτήν[a], θνητὴ δέ. Ἀλλὰ δύναται ἡ αὐτὴ καὶ μὴ ἀποθνήσκειν. Θνήσκει μὲν γὰρ καὶ λύεται μετὰ τοῦ σώματος μὴ γινώσκουσα τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Ἀνίσταται δὲ εἰς ὕστερον ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ κόσμου σὺν τῷ σώματι, θάνατον διὰ τιμωρίας ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ λαμβάνουσα. Πάλιν δὲ οὐ θνήσκει, κἂν πρὸς καιρὸν λυθῇ, τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ πεποιημένη. Καθ' ἑαυτὴν γὰρ σκότος ἐστὶ καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτῇ φωτεινόν...(Joh. i.) ...Ψυχὴ γὰρ οὐκ αὐτὴ τὸ πνεῦμα ἔσωσεν, ἐσώθη δὲ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. κ. τ. λ....Συζυγίαν δὲ κεκτημένη τὴν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, οὔκ ἐστιν ἀβοήθητος, ἀνέρχεται δὲ πρὸς ἅπερ αὐτὴν ὁδηγεῖ χωρία τὸ πνεῦμα. *Theophilus* (ad Aut. ii. 27.) starts the question: was Adam created with a mortal, or immortal nature? and replies; neither the one, nor the other, but he was fitted for both (δεκτικὸν ἀμφοτέρων), in order that he might receive immortality as a reward, and become God (γένηται θεός), if he aspired after it by rendering obedience to the Divine commandments; but that he might become the author of his own ruin, if he did the works of the devil, and disobeyed God.[b] *Ire-*

---

[a] καθ' ἑαυτὴν is wanting in the most recent manuscripts, vide *Daniel,* p. 228, on this passage.

[b] About the view of the Thnetopsychites (Arabici), compare below the chapter on Eschatology, § 76, note 8.)

næus also speaks only of an immortality which is given to man, see adv. Hær. ii. 64: Sine initio et sine fine, vere et semper idem et eodem modo se habens solus est Deus...Et de animalibus, de omnibus et de spiritibus et omnino de omnibus his, quæ facta sunt, cogitans quis minime peccabit, quando omnia, quæ facta sunt, initium quidem facturæ suæ habeant, perseverant autem, *quoadusque ex Deus et esse et perseverare voluerit. Non enim ex nobis, neque ex nostra natura vita est, sed secundum gratiam Dei datur.* Sicut autem corpus animale ipsum quidem non est anima, participatur autem animam, quoadusque Deus vult, sic et anima ipsa quidem non est vita, participatur autem a Deo sibi præstitam vitam.

(2) The opposition which *Tertullian* raised to the doctrine of Theophilus, etc., was connected with his notions concerning the twofold division of the soul, that of Origen with his views on pre-existence. (For the latter could easily dispose of the objection that the soul must have an end, because it has had a beginning.) Comp. however Tert. de anima. xi. xiv. xv. According to Orig. Exhort. ad Mart. 47. Opp. i. p. 307, de princ. ii. 11. 4, p. 105, and iii. 1. 13, p. 122, it is both the inherent principle of life in the soul, and its natural relation to God, which secure its immortality; comp. *Thomasius,* p. 159.

The whole question, however, had more of a philosophical, than Christian bearing, as the idea of immortality itself is abstract-negative. On the other hand, the believer by faith lays hold of eternal life in Christ as something really existing. The Christian doctrine of immortality cannot therefore be considered apart from the person, work, and kingdom of Christ, and must rest upon Christian perceptions and promises.

§ 59.

ON SIN, THE FALL OF THE FIRST MAN, AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

Walch, J. G., (*Th. Ch. Lilienthal*) de Pelagianismo ante Pelagium, Jen. 1738. 4. *Ejusdem* historia doctrinæ de peccato originis; both in Miscellaneis sacris, Amstel. 1744. 4. *Horn, J.*, Commentatio de sententiis eorum patrum, quorum auctoritas ante Augustinum plurimum valuit, de peccato originali, Gött. 1801. 4.

However much the primitive church was inclined, as we have already seen, to look with a favourable eye at the bright side of man (his ideal nature), yet she did not endeavour to conceal his dark side, by means of false idealism. Though it cannot be said, that the doctrine of human depravity was the only principle upon which the entire theology of that time was founded, yet every Christian was convinced by his consciousness of the existence of such a universal corruption, and felt the contrast between the ideal and the real, and the effects of sin in destroying the harmony of life. Such feelings were proportionate to the notions which were entertained concerning the liberty of man.

Thus *Justin M.*, complained of the universality of sin, dial. c. Tryph. c. 95. The whole human race is under the curse; for cursed is every one who does not keep the law; The author of the Clementine Homilies also supposes that the propensity to sin is now stronger, in consequence of its increase in man, and calls men the servants of sin, (δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίᾳ). hom. iv. 23. x. 4. *Schliemann*, p. 183. *Clement* of Alexandria directs our attention, in particular, to the internal conflict which sin has introduced into the nature of man; it does not form a part of our nature, nevertheless it is spread through the whole human race. We commit sin without knowing ourselves how it happens; comp. Strom. ii. p. 487. *Origen* also thinks the nature of man is universally corrupted, while the world is in a state of rebellion against its maker, contra Cels. iii. 66, p. 491: Σαφῶς γὰρ φαίνεται, ὅτι πάντες μὲν ἄνθρωποι πρὸς τὸ ἁμαρτάνειν πεφύκαμεν, ἔνιοι δὲ οὐ μόνον πεφύκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰθισμένοι εἰσὶν ἁμαρτάνειν. Comp. iii. 62, p. 488: Ἀδύνατον γὰρ φαμεν εἶναι ἄνθρωπον μετ᾽ ἀρετῆς ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἄνω βλέπειν· κακίαν γὰρ ὑφίστασθαι ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον ἐν ἀνθρώποις. Nevertheless the writers of the present period did not attach so much importance to the conviction of sin, as those of the following. On the contrary, feelings of gratitude and joy on account of the finished work of the Saviour, were more universally entertained, and counterbalanced by external contests and persecutions, rather than by internal struggles. The martyrdom of so many of the early Christians may be considered as a continuation of the celebration of the passion of Christ in the church; dogmatic theology, on the contrary, celebrated Christmas and Easter. But in later times, when persecutions ceased, men had recourse to monkish asceticism and a system of self-torture, as artificial substitutes. It then became a duty imperative upon the church to cultivate the *internal* martyrdom in opposition to those false external triumphs. The former consisted in the subjection of the heart to the power of the free grace of God in the sense of Augustine, which prepared the way for the regeneration of the church in after ages. Here we should be on our guard against a twofold error. The one is, to look for the same disposition during the first centuries which prevailed in later times, and, consequently, either to assert its existence, or to speak disparagingly of primitive Christianity because of its absence. The other is, to overlook the necessity for further developements, and to maintain that everthing ought to have remained in its state of comparative childhood or youth.

§ 60.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF SIN IN GENERAL.

Suicer, Thesaurus sub ἁμαρτάνω ἁμάρτημα, ἁμαρτία. ἁμαρτωλός. *Krabbe*, die Lehre von der Sünde und dem Tode, Hamburg, 1836. (dogmatico-exegetical.) **Müller, Julius*, die Christliche Lehre von der Sünde, Breslau, 1844, 2 vols.

The definitions of the nature of sin were to a great extent indefinite and unsettled during this period.(1) The heretical sects of the Gnostics in general (and in this particular they were the forerunners of Manichæism), starting with their dualistic notions, either ascribed the origin of evil to the demiurgus, or maintained that it was inherent in matter.(2) On the other hand, the orthodox theologians, generally speaking, agreed in tracing the source of evil to human volition, and clearing God from all imputation.(3) Such a view would easily lead to the opinion of *Origen*, that moral evil is something negative.(4)

(1) A proper definition (which is allied to that of the Stoics) is given *e. g.* by *Clement* of Alexandria, Pæd. i. 13, p. 158, 159 ; Πᾶν τὸ παρὰ τὸν λόγον τὸν ὀρθὸν, τοῦτο ἁμάρτημά ἐστι. Virtue (ἀρετή) on the contrary, is διάθεσις ψυχῆς σύμφωνος ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου περὶ ὅλον τὸν βίον. Hence sin is also disobedience to God : Αὐτίκα γοῦν ὅτε

ἥμαρτεν ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ παρήκουσε τοῦ Θεοῦ. He further considers sin on etymological grounds as error:……ὡς ἐξ ἀνάγκης εἶναι τὸ πλημμελούμενον πᾶν διὰ τὴν τοῦ λόγου διαμαρτίαν γινόμενον καὶ εἰκότως καλεῖσθαι ἁμάρτημα. Comp. Strom. ii. p. 462: Τὸ δὲ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐκ τοῦ ἀγνοεῖν κρίνειν ὅ τι χρὴ ποιεῖν συνίσταται ἢ τοῦ ἀδυνατεῖν ποιεῖν. The different kinds of sin are, ἐπειθυμία, φόβος and ἡδονή. The consequence of sin is the λήθη τῆς ἀληθείας, Coh. p. 88, and, lastly, eternal death, ib. p. 89. *Tertullian*, from a more practical point of view, ascribed the origin of sin to the *impatience* (inconsistency) of man, de pat. 5. (p. 143.): Nam ut compendio dictum sit, omne peccatum impatientiæ adscribendum. Comp. Cypr. de bono pat. p. 218. *Orig.* de princ. ii. 9. 2. Opp. T. i. p. 97. (Red. p. 216,) also believes that laziness and aversion to exertions for the purpose of persevering in good, as well as turning from the path of virtue, are the cause of sin; for going astray is nothing but becoming bad; to be bad only means not to be good, etc. comp. *Schnitzer*, p. 140.

(2) Now and then even orthodox theologians ascribe the origin of evil to sensuality: thus *Justin M.*, Apol. i. 10 (?) de resurr. c. 3, see *Semisch*, p. 400, 401. On the other hand, comp. *Clem.* Strom. iv. 36, p. 638, 39: Οὔκουν εὐλόγως οἱ κατατρέχοντες τῆς πλάσεως καὶ κακίζοντες τὸ σῶμα· οὐ συνορῶντες τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὀρθήν πρὸς τὴν οὐρανοῦ θέαν γενομένην, καὶ τὴν τῶν αἰσθησέων ὀργανοποιΐαν πρὸς γνῶσιν συντείνουσαν, τά τε μέλη καὶ μέρη πρὸς τὸ καλὸν, οὐ πρὸς ἡδονὴν εὔθετα. Ὅθεν ἐπιδεκτικὸν γίνεται τῆς τιμιωτάτης τῷ Θεῷ ψυχῆς τὸ οἰκητήριον τοῦτο κ. τ. λ. …Ἀλλ' οὔτε ἀγαθὸν ἡ ψυχὴ φύσει, οὔδε αὖ κακὸν φύσει τὸ σῶμα, οὐδὲ μὴν, ὃ μή ἐστιν ἀγαθὸν, τοῦτο εὐθέως κακόν. Εἰσὶ γὰρ οὖν καὶ μεσότητές τινες κ. τ. λ.

(3) Clem. Strom. vii. 2, p. 835: Κακίας δ' αὖ πάντη πάντως ἀναίτιος (ὁ Θεός.) Orig. contra Cels. vi. 55, p. 675: Ἡμεῖς δέ φαμεν, ὅτι κακὰ μὲν ἢ τὴν κακίαν καί τὰς ἀπ' αὐτῆς πράξεις ὁ θεός οὐκ ἐποίησε. Comp. iii. 69, p. 492. Nevertheless, he is of opinion that evil is also an object of Divine providence; comp. de princ. iii. 2, 7. Opp. i. p. 142.

(4) Orig. de princ. l. c. and in Joh. T. ii. c. 7. Opp. iv. p. 65, 66: Πᾶσα ἡ κακία οὐδέν ἐστιν (with reference to the word οὐδέν in John i. 3), ἐπεὶ καὶ οὐκ ὂν τυγχάνει. He terms evil ἀνυπόστατον, and the fall μείωσις diminutio). *J. Müller*, l. c. p. i. 134, ss.

§ 61.

INTERPRETATION OF THE NARRATIVE OF THE FALL.

The documents which have been preserved in the five books of Moses form the historical foundation not only of the doctrine of the creation of the world in general, and of man in particular, but also of the doctrine of the origin of sin, which appears realized in the history of Adam. Some writers, however, rejected the literal interpretation of this narrative. Thus *Origen* (after the example of Philo)(1) regarded it as a type, historically clothed, of that which takes place in moral agents everywhere, and at all times.(2) It is difficult to ascertain how far *Irenæus* adhered to the letter of the narrative.(3) *Tertullian* unhesitatingly pronounced in favour of its historical interpretation.(4) Both the Gnostics and the author of the Clementine Homilies rejected this view on dogmatic grounds.(5)

---

(1) *Philo* perceives in that narrative τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς vide *Dähne*, p 341, and his essay in the theologische Studien und Krit. 1833, 4th. part.

(2) *Clement* considers the narrative of the fall partly as fact, and partly as allegory, Strom. v. 11, p. 689, 90. (Serpent = image of voluptuousness.) On the other hand, *Origen* regards it as purely allegorical, de princ. iv. 16. Opp. T. i. p. 174, contra Cels. iv. 40, p. 534. Adam is called man, therefore: Ἐν τοῖς δοκοῦσι περὶ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ εἶναι φυσιολογεῖ Μωϋσῆς τὰ περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσεως...οὐχ οὕτως περὶ ἑνός τινος ὡς περὶ ὅλου τοῦ γένους ταῦτα φάσκοντος τοῦ θείου λόγου. Concerning the further application of allegorical interpretation to the particulars of the narrative (the act of clothing our first parents in skins as a symbol of spiritual investiture) comp. Meth. in Phot. Bibl. c. 234, and 293. On the other side see Orig. Fragm. in Gen. T. ii. p. 29, where both the literal interpretation is excluded, and the allegorical exposition is called in question. (Comp. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 342.)

(3) According to the fragment of Anastasius Sinaïta in Mas-

suet, p. 344, *Irenæus* must be understood as having explained the temptation by the serpent (in opposition to the Ophites), πνευματικῶς, not ἱστορικῶς, but it is not evident to what extent he did so. But Irenæus speaks elsewhere plainly enough of the fall of Adam as an historical fact, iii. 18. (Gr. 20.) p. 211. (Gr. 248.) iii. 21. (Gr. 31.) p. 218. (Gr. 259,) ss. Thus he labours to defend the threatening of God: "for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," from the chronological point of view, by taking the word "day" in the sense of "period," for "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." Adam and Eve died during that period on the same day on which they were created, and disobeyed the command of God, viz. on a *Friday*, adv. hær. v. 23. 2.

(4) *Tert.* adv. Judæos, ii. p. 184, de virg. vel. 11, adv. Marc. ii. 2, ss., and other passages. He insists upon the literal interpretation of the particulars of the narrative, as they succeeded each other in order of time: de resurr. carn. 61: Adam ante nomina animalibus enunciavit, quam de arbore decerpsit; ante etiam prophetavit, quam voravit.

(5) On the Gnostic (Basilidian) doctrine of the fall (σύγχυσις ἀρχική) comp. Clem. Strom. ii. 20, p. 488. *Gieseler*, Studien und Kritiken, 1830, p. 396. *Baur*, p. 211. The author of the Clementine Homilies goes so far in idealizing Adam, as to convert the historical person into a purely mythical being (like the Adam-Cadmon of the Cabbalists), while he represents Eve as far inferior to him. Hence Adam could not trespass, but sin makes its first appearance in *Cain*; vide *Credner*, ii. 258, iii. 284. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 339. *Schliemann*, p. 177. On the other hand, the Gnostic Cainites rendered homage to Cain as the representative of freedom from the thraldom of the demiurgus; the Sethites considered Cain as the representative of the hylic, Abel as that of the psychical, and Seth as that of the pneumatic principle, as the ideal of humanity. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, i. 2, p. 758, 759, [translat. ii. p. 105, 106.]

§ 62.

STATE OF INNOCENCE AND FALL.

The Fathers of the primitive church differed in their opinions concerning the original excellencies of the first man,(1) and the nature of his sin.(2) But they all believed that the temptation of the serpent was a real temptation to sin, and, accordingly, that the transgression of the Divine commandment was to be considered as a *fall* from a state of innocence followed by disastrous effects upon man.(3) On the contrary, the author of the Clementine Homilies denied that Adam could have sinned,(4) and the Ophites thought that by this event man was elevated to his proper dignity, (at least in one respect,) and prepared for the enjoyment of full liberty, because the prohibition had proceeded from the jealousy of Jaldabaoth, but the act of disobedience had been brought about by the intervention of wisdom (Sophia), the symbol of which is the serpent.(5)

(1) These were especially exaggerated by the author of the Clementine Homilies (see the preceding §.) Adam possessed prophetic gifts, hom. iii. 21, viii. 10. *Credner*, ii. p. 248, and *Baur*, p. 363,) which, however, *Tertullian* de resurr. carn c. 61, also ascribed to him. The Ophites taught that Adam and Eve had light and luminous bodies, see *Baur*, p. 187. The theologians, previous to the time of Augustine, attached less value to what was afterwards called justitia originalis. According to *Theophilus of Antioch* (ad Aut. ii. 24, 27.) Adam was νήπιος, and had to be treated as a child; he was neither mortal, nor immortal, but capable of either mortality or immortality. *Clement* of Alexandria maintains the same, Strom. vi. 12, p. 788: "They may learn from us (says he in opposition to the Gnostics), that Adam was created a perfect being, not in relation to his moral excellencies, but in respect to his *capacity* of choosing virtue; for there is certainly a difference between the aptitude to virtue, and the real possession of it. God will have us to be happy by our own exertions, hence it belongs to the nature of the soul to determine itself, etc." Comp. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 493. He thus limits the original excellencies, Strom. iv. p. 632, to what is purely human, viz. talents: Οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν χαρακτηριζόντων τὴν ἀνθρώπου ἰδέαν τε καὶ μορφὴν ἐνεδέησεν αὐτῷ.

(2) *Justin M.*, attributes the fall mainly to the cunning malignity of Satan, dial. c. Tryph. c. 119, p. 205. A beast (θηρίον)

seduced man. On his own part, he added disobedience and credulity; comp. *Semisch,* p. 393–94. *Clement of Alexandria* conceives that it was voluptuousness which caused the fall of the first man. Coh. p. 86: Ὄφις ἀλληγορεῖται ἡδονὴ ἐπὶ γαστέρα ἕρπουσα, κακία γηΐνη εἰς ὕλας τρεφομένη. Comp. Strom. iii. 17, p. 559, (470. Sylb.) Clement does not (like the Encratites whom he combats) find fault with the cohabitation of our first parents as a sinful act in itself, but he objects that it took place too soon; this is also implied in the passage Strom. ii. 19, p. 481: Τὰ μὲν αἰσχρὰ οὗτος προθύμως εἵλετο, ἑπόμενος τῇ γυναικί.

(3) The notion that the tree itself had been the cause of death (its fruit being venomous,) was combated by *Theophil.* ad Autol. ii. 25: Οὐ γάρ, ὡς οἴονταί τινες, θάνατον εἶχε τὸ ξύλον ἀλλ' ἡ παρακοή.

(4) Comp. § 61, note 5. Adam could not sin, because the θεῖον πνεῦμα, or the σοφία itself having been manifested in him, the latter must have sinned. But such an assertion would be impious.

(5) The Ophites confound their own doctrines, for at one time they render Divine homage to the serpent, at another they say, that Eve had been seduced by it. Epiph. Hær. 37. 6. *Baur*, p. 178, ss.

§ 63.

THE EFFECTS OF THE FALL.

Death was the punishment which God had threatened to inflict upon the transgressors of his laws. Nevertheless the act of transgression was not immediately succeeded by death, but by a train of evils which came both upon man and woman. Accordingly both death and physical evils were considered as the effects of Adam's sin; thus, *e. g.* by *Irenæus,* and others.(1) But the opinions of the Fathers were not as yet fully developed concerning the moral depravity of every individual, and the existence of sin in mankind generally, as the effect of the sin of the first man. Many felt too much disposed to look upon sin as the voluntary act of a moral agent, to conceive of a kind of hereditary tendency transmitted from one generation to another. The sinful acts of every individual appeared to them less the necessary consequence of the first sin, than a voluntary repetition of it.(2) In order to explain the mysterious power which almost compels men to sin, they had recourse not so much to original sin, as to a supposed influence of the demons, which, however, cannot *constrain* any man to trespass.(3) Nevertheless we meet in the writings of *Irenæus* with passages which show that he believed the effects of the fall to be of greater importance.(4) *Tertullian* and *Origen* alike favoured the theory of original sin, but on different grounds. Origen thought that the soul of man was stained with sin even in its former state, and thus enters in a sinful condition into the world. To this idea was added another, which was allied to the notions of Gnostics and Manichæans, viz. that physical generation is in itself a sinful act.(5) According to Tertullian, the soul propagates itself with all its defects and faults, as matter is propagated. The phrase " vitium originis," (original sin,) which was first used by him, is in perfect accordance with such a view.(6) But both were far from considering inherent depravity as constituting accountability, and still farther from believing in the entire absence of human liberty.(7)

---

(1) *Iren.* iii. 23, (35 Gr.) p. 221, (263 Gr.): Condemnationem autem transgressionis accepit homo tædia et terrenum laborem et manducare panem in sudore vultus sui et converti in terram, ex qua assumtus est; similiter autem mulier tædia et labores et gemitus et tristitias partus et servitium, *i. e.* ut serviret viro suo: ut neque maledicti a Deo in totum perirent, neque sine increpatione perseverantes Deum contemnerent (comp. c. 37, p. 264, *Grabe.*) ib. V. 15, p. 311, (423, *Grabe.*) :......propter inobedientiæ peccatum subsecuti sunt languores hominibus. V. 17, p. 313, (p. 426.) V. 23, p. 320, (p. 435): Sed quoniam Deus verax est, mendax autem serpens, de effectu ostensum est morte subsecuta eos, qui manducaverunt. Simul enim cum esca et mortem adsciverunt, quoniam inobedientes manducabant: ino-

bedientia autem Dei mortem infert, et sqq. (Hence the devil is called a murderer from the beginning.) But Irenæus also regards the penalty inflicted by God as a blessing, iii. 20. 1: Magnanimus (*i. e.* μακρόθυμος) fuit Deus deficiente homine, eam quæ per verbum esset victoriam reddendam ei providens. He compares the fall of man to the fate of the prophet Jonas, who was swallowed by the whale in order to be saved. Thus man is swallowed by the great whale (the devil) that Christ may deliver him out of his jaws. According to *Cyprian*, de bono patientiæ, p. 212, even the higher physical strength of man (along with immortality) was lost by the fall; *Origen* also connected the existence of evil in the world with sin. Comp. above, § 48.

(2) Though *Justin M.* uses strong expressions in complaining of the universal corruption of mankind (dial. c. Tryph. c. 95), he does not speak of original sin, and the imputation of Adam's guilt. Every man deserves death, his disobedience being equal to that of our first parents. Dial. c. Tr. c. 88: Ὃ (scil. γένος ἀνθρώπων) ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ ὄφεως ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν ἀιτίαν ἐκάστον αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου. C. 124: Οὗτοι (scil. ἄνθρωποι) ὁμοίως τῷ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῇ Εὔᾳ ἐξομοιούμενοι θάνατον ἑαυτοῦς ἐργάζονται, κ. τ. λ. Compare *Semisch.* l. c. p. 397–399. See ibid. p. 401, in reference to the difficult passage, dial. c. Tr. c. 100, which many have considered an argument for original sin: Παρθένος οὖσα Εὔα καὶ ἄφθορος τὸν λόγον τὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄφεως συλλαβοῦσα, παρακοὴν καὶ θάνατον ἔτεκε. According to *Clement of Alexandria*, man now stands in the same relation to the tempter, in which Adam stood prior to the fall, Coh. p. 7: Εἷς γὰρ ὁ ἀπατεὼν, ἄνωθεν μὲν τὴν Εὔαν, νῦν δὲ ἤδη καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους εἰς θάνατον ὑποφέρων, comp. Pæd. i. 13. 158. 59. Clement indeed admits the universality of sin among men, Pæd. iii. 12, p. 307: Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐξαμαρτάνειν πᾶσιν ἔμφυτον καὶ κοινόν; but the very circumstance that some appear to him by nature better than others (Strom. i. 6, p. 336,) shows that he did not consider man as absolutely depraved, nor pass a general sweeping judgment upon the whole human race, as if all formed but *one* vast mass of corruption. None commits iniquity for its own sake, Strom. i. 17, p. 368. But he rejects the doctrine of original sin properly called in the strongest terms, Strom. iii. 16, p. 556, 57: Λεγέτωσαν ἡμῖν ποῦ ἐπόρνευσεν τὸ γεννηθὲν παιδίον, ἢ πῶς ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑποπέπτωκεν ἀρὰν τὸ μηδὲν ἐνεργῆσαν. He does not regard the passage, Ps. li. 5, as decisive. (Comp. the above passages on liberty and sin in general.

(3) Athen. leg. c. 25. Tatian contra Græc. c. 7, and the passage quoted, § 58. Besides the influence of Satan, Justin M. also mentions bad education and evil examples, Apol. i. 61: Ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις καὶ πονηραῖς ἀνατροφαῖς γεγόναμεν.

(4) Irenæus adv. hær. iv. 41, 2, and other passages quoted by *Duncker*, p. 132, ss. According to Duncker, the doctrine of original sin, and hereditary depravity, is so much developed in the writings of Irenæus, " *that the characteristic features of the western scheme may be distinctly recognized.*" Irenæus indeed asserts that man, yielding on his own account to the voice of the tempter, had become a child, disciple, and servant of the devil. He also thinks that, in consequence of the sin of Adam, men are guilty in the sight of God. On the question whether Irenæus understands by that death which we have inherited, merely physical death, see *Duncker*, l. c.

(5) On the one hand, *Origen*, by insisting upon the freedom of the human will, forms a strong contrast with Augustine, and maintains that concupiscence in itself is not sinful, as long as it does not produce resolutions; guilt only arises when we yield to it, de princ. iii. 2. 2. Opp. T. i. p. 139. (Red. p. 279,) and iii. 4, (de humanis tentationibus.) But, on the other, he formally adopts the idea of original sin, by asserting that the human soul does not come into the world in a state of innocence, because it has already committed sin in its former condition; de princ. iii. 5. Opp. T. i. p. 149, 50. (Red. p. 309, ss.) Concerning the generation of man see Tom. xv. in Matth. § 23. Opp. iii. p. 685. Hom. viii. in Lev. Opp. ii. p. 229, and xii. p. 251: Omnis qui ingreditur hunc mundum in quadam contaminatione effici dicitur (Job xiv. 4, 5.)......Omnis ergo homo in patre et in matre pollutus est, solus vero Jesus Dominus meus in hanc generationem mundus ingressus est, et in matre non est pollutus. Ingressus est enim corpus incontaminatum.

(6) *Tert.* de anima c. 40: Ita omnis anima eo usque in Adam censetur, donec in Christo recenseatur; tamdiu immunda, quamdiu recenseatur. Peccatrix autem, quia immunda, recipiens ignominiam ex carnis societate, c. 41; he makes use of the phrase *vitium originis*, and maintains that man in his present corrupt state has got into the habit of sinning, while his *true* nature tends to virtue. He therefore distinguishes naturale quodammodo from proprie naturale. Quod enim a Deo est, non

tam extinguitur, quam obumbratur. Potest enim *obumbrari,* quia non est Deus, *extingui non potest, quia a Deo est.*

(7) That *e. g. Tertullian* was far from imputing original sin to children as actual transgression, may be seen from his remarkable expression concerning the baptism of infants, de bapt. 18. comp. § 72. and *Neander,* Antignosticus, p. 209, ss. 455, ss.—His disciple *Cyprian* also acknowledges inherent depravity, and defends infant-baptism on *that ground;* but he does not go farther than asserting, that it serves to purify infants from the guilt *of others* which is imputed to them, but not from any guilt which is properly *their own.* Ep. 64. Comp. *Rettberg,* p. 317, ss.

FOURTH SECTION.

CHRISTOLOGY AND SOTERIOLOGY.

§ 64.

ON CHRISTOLOGY IN GENERAL.

Martini, Versuch einer pragmatischen Geschichte des Dogma von der Gottheit Christi, Rostock 1800, 8. **Dorner*, Entwickelungsgeschichte der Christologie. Stuttgardt, 1839. 2nd edit. I. 1, 2. ibid. 1845. I. 3. 1846.

The incarnation of the Godman is the principal dogmatic idea of this period. The Fathers of the primitive church regarded it as a manifestation of the free grace of God, as the most glorious of all revelations and developements, and as the perfection and crown of creation, rather than as the mere effect of the sin of man. Thus the *Christology* of this period forms both the continuation of *theology*, and the supplement of *anthropology*.

According to *Irenæus* Christ has both *perfected* and *restored* the nature of man. This is expressed by the terms ἀνακεφαλαιοῦν, ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, (*i. e.* the repetition, renovation, and restoration of that which formerly existed, the reunion of that which was separated, comp. *Suicer*, thesaurus, sub voc.) Christ is the essence of all that is human in its highest significance, both the sum total and the renovation of mankind, the new Adam; comp. v. 29, 2; vii. 18, 7, and other passages quoted by *Duncker*, p. 157, ss. He frequently repeats the proposition, that Christ has become what *we* are, that *we* might be what *he* is, *e. g.* iii. 10, 20, and in the Præfatio: Jesus Christus, Dominus noster, propter immensam suam dilectionem factum est quod sumus nos, uti nos perficeret esse, quod est ipse. Similar views were entertained by the theologians of the Alexandrian school. On the contrary, *Tertullian* de carne Christi, c. 6, thinks that the incarnation of Christ had reference to his later sufferings. According to *Cyprian*, it has become necessary, not so much on account of the sin of Adam, as because of the disobedience of his descendants, on whom former revelations did not produce any effect, (in much the same manner as Heb. i. 1), de idol. van. p. 15: Quod vero Christus sit, et quomodo per ipsum nobis salus venerit, sic est ordo, sic ratio. Judæis primum erat apud Deum gratia. Sic olim justi erant, sic majores eorum religionibus obediebant. Inde illis et regni sublimitas floruit et generis magnitudo provenit. Sed illi negligentes, indisciplinati et superbi postmodum facti, et fiducia patrum inflati, dum divina præcepta contemnunt, datam sibi gratiam perdiderunt......Nec non Deus ante prædixerat fore, ut vergente sæculo, et mundi fine jam proximo, ex omni gente et populo et loco cultores sibi allegeret Deus multo fideliores et melioris obsequii; qui indulgentiam de divinis muneribus haurirent, quam acceptam Judæi contemtis religionibus perdidissent. Hujus igitur indulgentiæ, gratiæ disciplinæque arbiter et magister, sermo et filius Dei mittitur, qui per prophetas omnes retro illuminator et doctor humani generis prædicabatur. Hic est virtus Dei, hic ratio, hic sapientia ejus et gloria. Hic in virginem illabitur, carnem, Spiritu Sancto co-operante induitur. Deus cum homine miscetur. Hic Deus noster, hic Christus est, qui mediator duorum, hominem induit, quem perducat ad patrem. *Quod homo est, esse Christus voluit, ut et homo possit esse quod Christus est.* Comp. *Rettberg*, p. 305.

§ 65.

THE GODMAN.

Together with indefinite and more general expressions concerning the higher nature of Jesus(1) and his Messianic character,(2) we find even in the primitive church allusions to the intimate connection subsisting between his Divine and human natures. But the relation in which they stand to each other, is not exactly defined, nor is the part which either takes in the composition of his person, philosophically determined.(3) The earlier Fathers endeavoured on the one hand, to avoid the error of the Ebionites and Artemonites, who considered Jesus only as the son of Joseph and Mary (while the more moderate Nazarenes, in accordance with the Catholic church, admitted the supernatural conception.)(4) On the other, they combated still more decidedly the tendency of the Docetæ, who rejected the true humanity of Christ.(5) They also opposed the opinion of Cerinthus and Basilides, who asserted, that the Logos (Christ) had descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism; the still more fanciful notions of Marcion, according to which Christ appeared as Deus ex machina;(6) and lastly, the view of Valentinus, who admitted that Christ was born of Mary, but maintained that he made use of her only as of a channel, by which he entered into this finite world.(7)

---

(1) Thus in the letter of Pliny to Trajan (Ep. x. 97.): Carmen Christo quasi Deo dicere.—The usual doxologies, the baptismal formula, and the institution of the Christian festivals, bear witness to the Divine homage paid to Christ, by the primitive church; comp. *Dorner*, l. c. p. 273, ss. The superior excellency of his *doctrine* elevates Christ over the rest of mankind (according to *Justin Martyr*, Apol. i. 14.): Βραχεῖς δὲ καὶ σύντομοι παρ' αὐτοῦ λόγοι γεγόνασιν· οὐ γὰρ σοφιστὴς ὑπῆρχεν, ἀλλὰ δύναμις Θεοῦ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἦν, and this human wisdom would be sufficient by itself (according to c. 22.), to secure to Jesus the predicate of the Son of God, even though he were nothing but a mere man. But he is *more* than this: ibidem. *Origen* also points to the extraordinary personal character of Jesus (apart from his Divine dignity) which he considers as the bloom and crown of humanity, contra Cels. i. 29. Opp. T. i. p. 347, (in relation to Plato de rep. i. p. 329, and Plutarch in vita Themistoclis.)—"Jesus, the meanest and humblest of all Seriphii, yet caused a greater commotion in the world, than either Themistocles or Pythagoras, or Plato, yea than any wise man, prince or general." He unites in himself all human excellencies, while others have distinguished themselves by particular virtues, or particular actions; he is the miracle of

the world! c. 30. (He reasons altogether like modern apologists.) *Minucius Felix* does not go beyond the negative definition, that Jesus *was more than a mere man;* generally speaking, we find in his writings little or nothing of positive Christology; Octav. 29. § 2. 3. (comp. with 9. 5.): Nam quod religioni nostræ hominem noxium et crucem ejus adscribitis, longe de vicinia veritatis erratis, qui putatis Deum credi aut meruisse noxium aut potuisse terrenum. Næ ille miserabilis, cujus in homine mortali spes omnis innititur; totum enim ejus auxilium cum extincto homine finitur. Comp. *Novatian* de trin. 14: Si homo tantummodo Christus, cur spes in illum ponitur, cum spes in homine maledicta referatur? Concerning the christological views of the apostolical Fathers, see *Dorner*, l. c. p. 144, ss.

(2) *Justin M.* Apol. i. 5. 30, ss. dial. c. Tr. the whole context. Novatian de trin. c. 9. Orig. contra Cels. in various places.

(3) Thus *Justin M.* defended on the one hand the birth of Christ from the virgin in opposition to the Ebionites, and on the other, his true humanity in opposition to the Gnostics, dial. c. Tryph. c. 54: Οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χρ. ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων γεννηθείς. Apol. i. 46: Διὰ δυνάμεως τοῦ λόγου κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ βουλὴν διὰ παρθένου ἄνθρωπος ἀπεκυήθη. Comp. *Semisch*, ii. p. 403, ss, *Iren.* iii. 16, (18 Gr.) 18. (20 Gr.) p. 211, (248 Gr.): Ἥνωσεν οὖν, καθὼς προέφαμεν, τὸν ἄνθρωπον τῷ Θεῷ ......Εἰ μὴ συνηνώθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ Θεῷ, οὐκ ἂν ἠδυνήθη μετασχεῖν τῆς ἀφθαρσίας. Ἔδει γὰρ τὸν μεσίτην Θεοῦ τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων διὰ ἰδίας πρὸς ἐκατέρους οἰκειότητος εἰς φιλίαν καὶ ὁμόνοιαν τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους συναγαγεῖν καὶ Θεῷ μὲν παραστῆσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἀνθρώποις δὲ γνωρίσαι Θεόν. c. 19. (21.) p. 212. 13. (250.): Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἵνα πειρασθῇ, οὕτως καὶ λόγος, ἵνα δοξασθῇ· ἡσυχάζοντος μὲν τοῦ λόγου ἐν τῷ πειράζεσθαι............καὶ σταυροῦσθαι καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν· συγγινομένου δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐν τῷ νικᾶν καὶ ὑπομένειν καὶ χρηστεύεσθαι καὶ ἀνίστασθαι καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι. *Irenæus* also advocates the true humanity of the Saviour, in opposition to the Docetæ, and his true divinity in opposition to the Ebionites. As Adam had no human father, so Christ is begotten without the instrumentality of a man; as the former was formed of pure (virginal) soil, so the latter is born of a pure virgin. On the one hand, we have the sinful flesh of Adam, on the other a sinless one, on the one hand, the homo ψυχικὸς, on the other the h. πνευματικός, iii. 21. 10. *Duncker*, p. 218, ss. Comp. *Novatian*, de trin. c. 18: Quoniam si ad hominem veniebat, ut mediator

Dei et hominum esse deberet, oportuit illum cum eo esse et verbum carnem fieri, ut in semetipso concordiam confibularet terrenorum pariter atque cœlestium, dum utriusque partis in se connectens pignora, et Deum homini et hominem Deo copularet, ut merito filius Dei per assumtionem carnis filius hominis, et filius hominis per receptionem Dei verbi filius Dei effici possit. Hoc altissimum atque reconditum sacramentum ad salutem generis humani ante sæcula destinatum, in Domino Jesu Christo Deo et homine invenitur impleri, quo conditio generis humani ad fructum æternæ salutis posset adduci.

(4) Comp. § 23, 24, and § 42, note 1. On the mild manner in which Justin M. dial. c. Tryph. § 48, and Origen (in Matth T. xvi. c. 12. Opp. iii. p. 732, comparison with the blind man, Mark x. 46,) judged of the view of the Ebionites, see *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, i. p. 616, 17. [transl. ii. p. 12, 13.] But Origen expresses himself in stronger terms in Hom. xv. in Jerem. ib. p. 226: *'Ετόλμησαν γὰρ μετὰ τῶν πολλῶν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων κακῶν καὶ τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι θεὸς ὁ μονογενὴς ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως· ἐπικατάρατος γὰρ ὃς τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχει ἐπ' ἄνθρωπον.* The common Ebionites themselves supposed that a higher power had united itself with the man Jesus at his baptism. The Ebionites, whose views are represented by the Clementine Homilies, differed from the former, by asserting that Jesus had from the beginning been pervaded with the said power; in their opinion he ranks with Adam, Enoch, and Moses, comp. *Schleimann*, p. 200, ss., 483, ss. Concerning the birth from the virgin, it is worthy of observation, that the primitive church had no doubts about the propriety of adducing analogies with pagan myths as a kind of evidence, though the reality of the fact was admitted. Thus Orig. contra Cels. i. 37. Opp. T. i. p. 355. (Plato a son of Apollo and of Amphictione); at the same place an analogy is drawn from nature in opposition to the blasphemy of Celsus, c. 32. p. 350, comp. however, c. 67, p. 381. [a]

(5) Against the Docetæ comp. the Epistles of *Ignatius*, especially ad Smyrn. 2. and 3. ad Ephes. 7. 18. ad Trall. 9, also the aforecited passage of Irenæus, and with it Tert. adv. Marc. and

---

[a] On the different recensions of what is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, comp. *King*, p. 145. The phrase: conceptus de Spiritu Sancto is wanting in the earlier recensions, and one reads: qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Maria Virg.

de carne Christi; *Novatian* de trin. c. 10: Neque igitur eum hæreticorum agnoscimus Christum, qui in imagine (ut dicitur) fuit, et non in veritate; nihil verum eorum quæ gessit, fecerit, si ipse phantasma et non veritas fuit. Some have thought that there is a leaning towards Docetism in the epistle of Barnabas, c. 5. But we have there the same idea of the κρύψις which occurs in later times, *e. g.* in the (apocryphal) oration of Thaddæus to Abgarus apud Euseb. 1. 13: Ἐσμίκρυνεν αὐτοῦ τὴν ϑεότητα, and elsewhere.

(6) Tertull. de carne Christi, c. 2: Odit moras Marcion, qui subito Christum de cœlis deferebat. Adv. Marc. iii. 2: Subito filius, et subito missus, et subito Christus. iv. 11: Subito Christus, subito et Johannes. Sic sunt omnia apud Marcionem, quæ suum et plenum habent ordinem apud creatorem.

(7) Καϑάπερ ὕδωρ διὰ σωλῆνος ὁδεύει, comp. *Neander*, gnost. Systeme, p. 136, ss. On the Docetism of the Gnostics in general, see *Baur*, p. 258, ss.: "*Basilides is nearest to the orthodox view, Marcion departs farthest from it, and Valentinus, with his psychical Christ, occupies an intermediate position.*"

§ 66.

FURTHER DEVELOPEMENT OF THIS DOCTRINE.

* *Gieseler, J. C. L.*, Commentatio, qua Clementis Alexandrini et Origenis doctrinæ de corpore Christi exponuntur, Götting. 1837. 4.

Though the doctrine of the Catholic church, in opposition to the aforesaid heretical theories, rested upon the simple declaration of John: ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, and thus preserved the idea of the Godman which is peculiar to Christianity, in the necessary connection between the Divine and the human,(1) yet it was modified by the influence of various dispositions of mind and modes of thinking. Thus it is not quite evident from the phraseology of the earliest Fathers *prior* to the time of Origen(2) (with the exception of *Irenæus*(3) and *Tertullian*,(4) (whether they thought that the soul of Jesus formed a part of his humanity or not. Nor does *Clement* of Alexandria make a strict distinction between the human and Divine natures of Christ.(5) Concerning his body the theologians of the Alexandrian school adopted views, which were closely allied to those of the Docetæ, although they opposed the grosser forms of Docetism. *Clement* maintained that the body of Jesus was not subject to the accidents of the external world with the same physical necessity as other human bodies,(6) and *Origen* went so far as to ascribe to it the property of appearing to different persons under different forms.(7) On the other hand, he was very clear and decided on the doctrine of the human soul of Christ,(8) and, generally speaking, he speculated more than his predecessors on the mystery of Christ's incarnation.(9) He also first made use of the expression θεάνθρωπος.(10)

---

(1) *Novat.* de trin. c. 10: Non est ergo in unam partem inclinandum et ab alia parte fugiendum, quoniam nec tenebit perfectam veritatem, quisquis aliquam veritatis excluserit portionem. Tam enim scriptura etiam Deum adnuntiat Christum, quam etiam ipsum hominem adnuntiat Deum, etc.

(2) According to *Justin M.*, Christ had a soul, but not a νοῦς. Its place was supplied by the λόγος. In his opinion, Christ is composed of λόγος, ψυχή, and σῶμα, Apol. min. c. 10, comp. *Semisch*, p. 410.

(3) *Duncker* endeavours to prove from the passages quoted by him, especially iii. 22. 1; v. 6. 1, that *Irenæus* taught the perfect humanity of Christ as regards body, soul, and spirit; he also adduces the passage v. 1. 3, to which others have attached the opposite sense.

(4) *Tert.* adv. Prax. c. 30, takes the exclamation of Christ on the cross: My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me! as a vox carnis et animæ, cf. de carne Christi c. 11–13: Non poterat Christus inter homines nisi homo videri. Redde igitur Christo fidem suam, ut qui homo voluerit incedere animam quoque humanæ conditionis ostenderit, non faciens eam carneam, sed induens eam carne. Comp. de resurr. carn. c. 34, and other less definite passages (only in relation to the assuming of the flesh) which are given by *Münscher* von Cölln i. p. 261–63.

(5) He indulges in harsh contrasts, such as Coh. p. 6, and p. 84: Πίστευσον, ἄνθρωπε, ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ Θεῷ· πίστευσον, ἄνθρωπε, τῷ παθόντι καὶ προσκυνουμένῳ Θεῷ ζῶντι· πιστεύσατε, οἱ δοῦλοι, τῷ νεκρῷ· πάντες ἄνθρωποι, πιστεύσατε μόνῳ τῷ πάντων ἀνθρώπων Θεῷ· πιστεύσατε καὶ μισθὸν λάβετε σωτηρίαν. ἐκζητήσατε τὸν Θεὸν καὶ ζήσεται ἡ ψυχή ὑμῶν. He does not make the distinction drawn by others, according to which the name Ἰησοῦς should be used only in reference to his *human* nature; on the contrary, Pæd. i. 7, p. 131, he says: Ὁ δὲ ἡμέτερος παιδαγωγὸς ἅγιος θεὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ πάσης τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος καθηγεμὼν λόγος. He also applies the subject, ὁ λόγος to his humanity, Pæd. i. 6, p. 124: Ὁ λόγος τὸ αὑτοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐξέχεεν αἷμα, comp. iii. 1. p. 251, and *Gieseler*, l. c. *Novatian*, (c. 18, ss.) who lived towards the close of this period, separates the Divine from the human nature in Christ with more distinctness, and strongly opposes every attempt at idolizing his humanity, Patripassianism, etc.

(6) Pæd. iii. 2, p. 186, (Sylb. 158,) he most decidedly maintains, in opposition to the Docetæ, that Jesus ate and drank like other men, but very moderately; comp. Strom. vii. 17, p. 900, where he calls the Docetæ heretics; hence the charge which Photius (Bibl. Cod. 109.) brought forward against him, viz. that the doctrine of a phantom is propounded in his work entitled the Hypotyposes (μὴ σαρκωθῆναι τὸν λόγον, ἀλλὰ δόξαι,) is justly considered as unfounded. Comp. however *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 258.) But, after all, Clement refines the human body of Jesus to little more than a kind of phantom, Strom. vi. 9, p. 775. (Sylb. p. 158, given by *Gieseler*, l. c. p. 12,) where he regards the eating and drinking of our Lord only as an accommodation to human nature, and calls it even *ridiculous* (γέλως)) to think otherwise; for according to him the body of Jesus was sustained by a Divine power, but not by meats and drinks. Clement admits that his body was bruised and died, but he maintains that his sufferings were only apparent, inasmuch as the Redeemer when on the cross, felt no pains; comp. Pæd. i. c. 5, p. 112, and *Gieseler* on that pass. p. 13. Clement also teaches that his Divine nature was veiled during his manifestation (κρύψις) in the flesh, Strom. vii. 2, p. 833, though he does not use these very words. In accordance with such sentiments, he asserts that Jesus was deformed, Pæd. iii. 1. sub finem, p. 252, because he could not otherwise explain Is. liii., while, on the other hand, he elevates the body of Jesus far above all other organisms. The

Saviour did not manifest himself by that beauty of the flesh which strikes the senses, but by the beauty of the soul, and the *true* beauty of the body, viz. immortality. The same supposition is made by *Tertullian*, de carne Christi, c. 9.: Adeo nec humanæ honestatis corpus fuit, nedum cœlestis claritatis. The assumption of the uninterrupted virginity of Mary, Strom. vii. 16, p. 889–890., and the (apocryphal) passage there cited: Τέτοκεν καὶ οὐ τέτοκεν, may be traced to the same docetic tendency. Different views are entertained by *Tertull.* de carne Christi, sub finem, who nevertheless quotes the same dictum.

(7) *Gennadius* de dogm. eccles. c. 2, incorrectly numbers Origen among those, qui Christum carnem de cœlo secum afferre contenderint: but his doctrine too is not quite free from Docetism. It is most fully given in the Comment. in Ep. ad Gal. preserved by Pamphilus; comp. *Gieseler*, l. c. p. 16, 17, and contra Cels. i. 69, 70. Opp. i. p. 383, 84, (ibid. iii. 42, p. 474,) de princ. ii. 6, § 6. Hom. in Gen. i. Opp. ii. p. 55: Non æqualiter omnes, qui vident, illuminantur a Christo, sed singuli secundum eam mensuram illuminantur, qua vim luminis recipere valent. Et sicut non æqualiter oculi corporis nostri illuminantur a sole, sed quanto quis in loca altiora conscenderit, et ortum ejus editioris speculæ intuitione fuerit contemplatus, tanto amplius et splendoris ejus vim percipiet et caloris: ita etiam mens nostra quanto altius et excelsius appropinquaverit Christo, ac se viciniorem splendori lucis ejus objecerit, tanto magnificentius et clarius ejus lumine radiabitur. With this assumption he connects the transfiguration on the mount, contra Cels. ii. 64. Opp. i. p. 435, and Comment. in Matth. Opp. iii. p. 906. *Gieseler*, p. 19, ss., comp. contra Cels. iv. 16, p. 511: Εἰσὶ γὰρ διάφοροι οἱονεὶ τοῦ λόγου μορφαὶ, καθὼς ἑκάστῳ τῶν εἰς ἐπιστήμην ἀγομένων φαίνεται ὁ λόγος, ἀνάλογον τῇ ἕξει τοῦ εἰσαγομένου, ἢ ἐπ' ὀλίγον προκόπτοντος, ἢ ἐπὶ πλεῖον, ἢ καὶ ἐγγὺς ἤδη γινομένου τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἢ καὶ ἐν ἀρετῇ γεγενημένου.

(8) De princ. iv. 31: Volens Filius Dei pro salute generis humani apparere hominibus et inter homines conversari, suscepit non solum corpus humanum, ut quidam putant, sed et animam, nostrarum quidem animarum similem per naturam, proposito vero et virtute similem sibi, et talem, qualis omnes voluntates et dispensationes verbi ac sapientiæ indeclinabiliter possit implere. (Joh. 10. 18; 12. 27. Matth. 26. 28.) Comp. contra Cels. ii. 9, quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 263, where he in-

fers the human soul of the Saviour from Matth. 26. 38. Origen's theory of the pre-existence of the soul would easily induce him to ask, why the Son of God assumed *this* very soul, and not any other? comp. contra Cels. i. 32. (Opp. i. p. 350.) de princ. ii. 6. 3. quoted by *Münscher*, p. 265, ss. According to Socrat. iii. 7, the Synod of Bostra, (A. D. 240,) defended the proposition: ἔμψυχον εἶναι τὸν ἐνανθρωπήσαντα in opposition to Beryllus. On the christological views of Origen in general, see *Dorner*, ii. 2, p. 942, ss.

(9) *Origen* observes that a twofold error ought to be guarded against: (1.) that of excluding the Logos from Christ, as if the eternal Logos and the historical Christ were two distinct, separate individuals; (2.) that of confounding the former with the latter, as if he did not exist apart from him, de princ. iv. c. 30: ...Non ita sentiendum est, quod omnis divinitatis ejus majestas intra brevissimi corporis claustra conclusa est, ita ut omne verbum Dei et sapientia ejus ac substantialis veritas ac vita vel a patre divulsa sit, vel intra corporis ejus coërcita et conscripta brevitatem, nec usquam præterea putetur operata: sed inter utrumque causa pietatis esse debet confessio, ut neque aliquid divinitatis in Christo defuisse credatur, et nulla penitus a paterna substantia, quæ ubique est, facta putetur esse divisio...Cap. 31: Ne quis tamen nos existimet per hæc illud affirmare, quod pars alibi vel ubique: quod illi sentire possunt, qui naturam substantiæ incorporeæ atque invisibilis ignorant. Comp. also contra Cels. iv. 5. The Logos in his incarnate state is like the sun whose beams remain pure, wherever they may shine, (contra Cels. vi. 73.) Nevertheless, Origen asserts that he had laid aside his glory, in Jerem. hom. x. 7. (Opp. iii. p. 186.) The Father is the light as such, the Son is the light which shines in darkness, comp. Comm. in Joh. ii. 18. (Opp. iv. p. 76.) and de princ. i. 28. The humanity of Christ has ceased to exist after his ascension, comp. hom. in Jerem. xv. (Opp. iii. p. 226.: Εἰ καὶ ἦν ἄνθρωπος (ὁ σωτὴρ), ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐδαμῶς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος. Comp. hom. in Luc. xxix: (Opp. iii. p. 967): Tunc homo fuit, nunc autem homo esse cessavit. See *Dorner*, l. c. p. 671, ss. *Thomasius*, p. 202, ss.

(10) See *Dorner*, l. c. p. 679, note 40. The phrase in question occurs (for aught we know) only in the Latin translation of hom. in Ezech. iii. 3. (Deus homo); but it is implied in other passages,

e. g., contra Cels. iii. 29; vii. 17. Comp. *Thomasius*, p. 203, note c. The Greek term was first explained by Chrysostom, see *Suicer* thesaurus sub voce.

A special question arose concerning the *risen* body of Christ in its relation to the body which he possessed prior to the resurrection. According to *Ignatius*, *Justin*, *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and *Novatian* Jesus had the same body *after* the resurrection which he had *before* it. Comp. the passages in the work of *C. L. Müller*, de resurrectione Jesu Christi, vitam eam excipiente et ascensu in cœlum, sententiæ, quæ in ecclesia christiana ad finem usque sæculi sexti viguerunt. Havniæ, 1836, 8. p. 77. Some expressions of Irenæus and Tertullian are somewhat modified, p. 78. But *Origen* taught in more definite terms, c. Cels. ii. c. 62. Opp. i. p. 434, that the body of Jesus had undergone a change, and, in support of his opinion, appealed to his miraculous appearance, when the doors were shut: Καὶ ἦν γε μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν αὐτοῦ ὡ περεὶ ἐν μεθορίῳ τινὶ τῆς παχύτητος τοῦ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους σώματος καὶ τοῦ γυμνὴν τοιούτου σώματος φαίνεσθαι ψυχήν. Comp. c. 64, 65, p. 436: Τὸν μηκέτι ἔχοντά τι χωρητὸν ὁραθῆναι τοῖς πολλοῖς, οὐχ οἷοί τε ἦσαν αὐτὸν βλέπειν οἱ πρότερον αὐτὸν ἰδόντες πάντες . . . . λαμπροτέρα γὰρ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τελέσαντος ἡ θειότης ἦν αὐτοῦ. *Müller*, p. 83. Origen does not seem to have believed that the ascension of Christ had effected a further change; for probably he understands by the ethereal body, which he ascribes to him in his state of exaltation, (c. Cels. iii. 41, 42. Opp. i. p. 474), the same which he had when he rose from the grave. Comp. *Müller*, p. 82, and p. 131.

§ 67.

THE SINLESSNESS OF CHRIST.

Ulmann, über die Sündlosigkeit Jesu, 5th edit. Hamb. 1846. [Ulmann on the Sinless Character of Jesus, in Clark's Student's Cabinet Library of Useful Tracts.] *Fritzsche*, de ἀναμαρτησίᾳ Jesu Christi, Comment. iv. comp. § 17.

The intimate connection subsisting between the Divine and human natures of Christ, which was held even by the primitive church, excluded every idea of the existence of sin in him, who was the image of the Deity. Hence *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Clement*, and *Origen* assert the sinlessness (anamartesia) of Jesus in the strongest terms,(1) and even those of the Fathers who do not expressly mention it, at least presuppose it. In the scheme of the Ebionites and Artemonites, this sinlessness was not a necessary feature of his character, although we do not meet with any intimations to the contrary. On the other hand *Basilides* found it difficult to reconcile the sinlessness of Christ with his system, according to which every sufferer bears the punishments of his own sins, though he used every possible means to conceal this defect in his scheme.(2)

(1) *Justin M.* dial. c. Tr. § 11, 17, 110, et al. *Iren.* in the next §. *Tert.* de anima cap. 41: Solus enim Deus sine peccato, et solus homo sine peccato Christus, quia et Deus Christus. *Clem. Al.* infers (Pæd. i. 2. p. 99,) the prerogative of Christ to be the judge of all men, from his sinlessness. In Pæd. iii. 12, p. 307, he speaks indeed of the *Logos* being alone ἀναμάρτητος, but as he makes no distinction between the Logos and the human nature of Christ, (comp. the preceding §), it would follow that he regarded Jesus as sinless, which is confirmed by what he says, Strom. vii. 12, p. 875. (Sylb. 742): Εἷς μὲν οὖν μόνος ὁ ἀνεπιθύμητος (which implies still more than ἀναμάρτητος) ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ κύριος, ὁ φιλάνθρωπος, ὁ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος. Concerning *Origen*, comp. § 63, note 5. Hom. xii. in Lev. Opp. ii. p. 251...Solus Jesus dominus meus in hanc generationem mundus ingressus est, etc. In de princ. ii. c. 6, § 5, 6. (Opp. i. p. 91,) he endeavours to remove the difficulty which arises when we assume the absolute sinlessness of our Lord, in opposition to the assumption of a free spiritual developement. Verum quoniam boni malique eligendi facultas omnibus præsto est, hæc anima, quæ Christi est, ita elegit diligere justitiam, ut pro immensitate dilectionis inconvertibiliter ei atque inseparabiliter inhæreret, ita ut propositi firmitas et affectus immensitas et dilectionis inextinguibilis calor omnem sensum conversionis atque immutationis abscinderet, et quod in arbitrio erat positum, longi usus affectu jam, versum sit in naturam: ita et fuisse quidem in Christo humana et rationabilis anima credenda est, et nullum sensum vel possibilitatem eam putandum est habuisse peccati (simile of an iron which is always exposed to fire.) Christ possesses sinlessness as something peculiar to himself; Sicut vas ipsum, quod substantiam continet unguenti, nullo genere potest aliquid recipere fœtoris: hi vero qui ea odore ejus

participant, si se paulo longius a fragrantia ejus removerint, possibile est, ut incidentem recipiant fœtorem, ita Christus velut vas ipsum, in quo erat unguenti substantia, impossibile fuit, ut contrariam reciperet odorem. Participes vero ejus quam proximi fuerint vasculo, tam odoris erunt participes et capaces. Comp. contra Cels. i. 69. Opp. i. p. 383: Διὸ πρὸς τοῖς ἄλλοις καὶ μέγαν ἀγωνιστὴν αὐτόν φαμεν γεγονέναι, διὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον σῶμα, πεπειρασμένον μεν ὁμοίως πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κατὰ πάντα, οὐκέτι δὲ ὡς ἄνθρωποι μετὰ ἁμαρτίας, ἀλλὰ πάντη χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. (Hebr. iv. 15, where 1 Pet. ii. 22, and 2 Cor. v. 21 are also quoted.) The term ἀναμάρτητος first occurs in the writings of Hippolytus (*Gallandii*, bibl. ii. p. 466.)

(2) Comp. Clem. Strom. iv. p. 600. (Sylb. 506,) and *Neander*, Gnost. Syst. p. 49, ss. *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, p. 24.

§ 68.

ON REDEMPTION AND ATONEMENT.

(The Death of Christ.)

Dissertatio historiam doctrinæ de redemtione ecclesiæ, sanguine Jesu Christi facta exhibens, in *Cotta's* edition of *Gerhard's* loci theologici. T. iv. p. 105–132. *W. C. L. Ziegler*, historia dogmatis de redemtione, etc. inde ab ecclesiæ primordiis usque ad Lutheri tempora, Gött. 1791. (in comment. theol. ed. *A. Velthusen*, T. v. p. 227, seq.) **Bähr, K.* die Lehre der Kirche vom Tode Jesu in den ersten 3 Jahrhunderten, Sulzb. 1832, reviewed in the neue Kirchenzeitung 1833, No. 36. *Baur, F. Ch.* die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung von der ältesten bis auf die neueste Zeit, Tübingen 1838, (p. 1–67.)

The tendency of Christ's appearance on earth, as such, was to redeem men from sin, and to reconcile them to God, inasmuch as it destroyed the power of the devil, and restored the harmony of the human nature.(1) But in accordance with the doctrine preached by the Apostles, the sufferings and death of Christ were from the commencement thought to be of principal importance in the work of redemption. The Fathers of the primitive church regarded his death as a sacrifice and ransom (λύτρον), and therefore ascribed to his blood the power of cleansing from sin and guilt,(2) and attached a high importance, sometimes even a supernatural efficacy to the sign of the cross.(3) They did not, however, rest satisfied with vague and indefinite ideas, but, in connection with the prevailing notions of the age, they further developed the above doctrine, and represented the death of Christ as the actual victory over the devil, the restoration of the Divine image, and the source and condition of all happiness.(4) But, however, decidedly and victoriously this enthusiastic faith in the power of the Redeemer's death manifested itself in the writings and lives of the Fathers, as well as in the persecutions and death of so many Christians, yet that *theory of satisfaction* had not then been formed, which represents Christ as *satisfying* the justice of God by suffering in the room of the sinner the punishment due to him. The term "*satisfactio*," occurs indeed in the writings of *Tertullian*, but in a sense essentially different from, and even opposed to the idea of a sacrifice made by a *substitute*.(5) That the design of the death of Christ was to reconcile man to God, was an opinion held by more than one of the Fathers in connection with other doctrines. *Origen* himself not only developed both the notion that the devil had been outwitted, and the idea of a sacrifice founded upon the typical language of the Old Testament,(6) but also decided in favour of the moral interpretation of Christ's death, which he did not hesitate to compare with the heroic death of other great men of antiquity.(7) He also ascribed somewhat of the effects of an atonement to the death of the martyrs, as *Clement* had done before him.(8) And, lastly, he understood the death of Jesus in an idealistic sense, as an event which is not limited to this world nor to one single moment of time, but which has come to pass in heaven as well as on earth, embraces all ages, and is also of infinite importance to the other world.(9)

(1) " *Christianity is not only the religion of redemption, inasmuch as it realizes the idea of the union of the Divine and the*

human in the person of the Godman, but also the religion of complete and absolute reconciliation." *Baur*, l. c. p. 5. Concerning the relation in which redemption stands to reconciliation, ibid. On negative and positive redemption, see *Neander*, Kircheng. i. p. 1070, [transl. ii. p. 310.] According to *Justin M.*, the renovation and restoration of mankind is brought about by the *doctrine* of Christ. Apol. I. 23: Γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος ταῦτα ἡμᾶς ἐδίδαξεν ἐπ' ἀλλαγῇ καὶ ἐπαναγωγῇ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείους γένους. Comp. Apol. II. 6. Coh. ad Græc. 38. dial. c. Tryph. § 121; § 83, and § 30: 'Απὸ γὰρ τῶν δαιμονίων, ἅ ἐστιν ἀλλότρια τῆς θεοσεβείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἷς πάλαι προσεκυνοῦμεν, τὸν Θεὸν ἀεὶ διὰ 'Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ συντηρηθῆναι παρακαλοῦμεν ἵνα μετὰ τὸ ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς Θεὸν δι' αὐτοῦ ἄμωμοι ὦμεν. Βοηθὸν γὰρ ἐκεῖνον καὶ λυτρωτὴν καλοῦμέν· οὗ καὶ τὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος ἰσχὺν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια τρέμει, κ. τ. λ. *Irenæus* speaks rather of the positive aspect, iii. 18. (20.) 20. (22.) p. 214......Filius hominis factus est, ut assuesceret hominem percipere Deum et assuesceret Deum habitare in homine, sec. placitum Patris. The work of redemption was carried on through all the stages of life which Christ represented in himself, so that death appears as the crown of the entire work, ii. 22. 4. p. 147: Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes et parvulos et pueros et juvenes et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem, et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes; in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem, simul, et exemplum illis pietatis effectus et justitiæ et subjectionis: in juvenibus juvenis, exemplum juvenibus fiens, et sanctificans Domino; sic et senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus, non solum secundum expositionem veritatis, sed et secundum ætatem, sanctificans simul et seniores, exemplum ipsis quoque fiens; deinde et usque ad mortem pervenit, ut sit primogenitus ex mortuis, ipse primatum tenens in omnibus, princeps vitæ, prior omnium et præcedens omnes. Comp. v. 16.—Comp. *Tert.* adv. Marc. 12. *Clem.* Coh. p. 6, p. 23: 'Ημεῖς δὲ οὐκ ὀργῆς θρέμματα ἔτι, οἱ τῆς πλάνης ἀπεσπασμένοι, ἀΐσσοντες δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Ταύτῃ τοι ἡμεῖς, οἱ τῆς ἀνομίας υἱοί ποτε, διὰ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν τοῦ λόγου νῦν υἱοὶ γεγόναμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ. Pæd. i. 2, p. 100: Ἔστιν οὖν ὁ παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν λόγος διὰ παραινέσεων θεραπευτικὸς τῶν παρὰ φύσιν τῆς ψυχῆς παθῶν...λόγος δὲ ὁ πατρικὸς μόνος ἐστὶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἰατρὸς ἀῤῥωστημάτων παιώνιος καὶ ἐπῳδὸς ἅγιος νοσούσης ψυχῆς. Comp. i. 9, p. 147, i. 12, p. 158, quis div. salv. p. 951, 52. (Comparison with the merciful Samaritan.) *Origen* also (contra Cels. iii. 28. Opp. i. p.

465,) perceives in the union of the Divine and the human in Christ the *commencement* of an intimate connection between the one and the other, which is progressively developed in mankind : Ὅτι ἀπʼ ἐκείνου ἤρξατο θεία καὶ ἀνθρωπίνη συνυφαίνεσθαι φύσις· ἵνʼ ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη τῇ πρὸς τὸ θειότερον κοινωνίᾳ γένηται θεία οὐκ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς μετὰ τοῦ πιστεύειν ἀναλαμβάνουσι βίον, ὃν Ἰησοῦς ἐδίδαξεν.[a]

(2) *Barn.* c. 5 : Propter hoc Dominus sustinuit tradere corpus suum in exterminium, ut remissione peccatorum sanctificemur, quod est sparsione sanguinis illius, etc., comp. c. 7, 11, and 12. *Clem. Rom.* ad Cor. i. c. 7 : Ἀτενίσωμεν εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἴδωμεν, ὡς ἔστιν τίμιον τῷ θεῷ (αἷμα) αὐτοῦ, ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκχυθὲν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ μετανοίας χάριν ὑπήνεγκεν, comp. i. c. 2, where the παθήματα αὐτοῦ grammatically refer to Θεὸς. (*Möhler*, Patrology, i. p. 61.) *Ign.* ad Smyrn. 6 : Μηδεὶς πλανάσθω. Καὶ τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ ἡ δόξα τῶν ἀγγέλων, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ὁρατοί τε καὶ ἀόρατοι, ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, κἀκείνοις κρίσις ἐστιν. (He also defended the reality of his bodily sufferings in opposition to the Docetæ, c. 2.) Comp. *Höfling*, die Lehre der Apostolischen Väter vom Opfer im christlichen Cultus, 1841. According to *Justin M.*, the *design* of Christ's incarnation is his sufferings for the good of mankind, Apol. ii. 13 : Διʼ ἡμᾶς ἄνθρωπος γέγονεν, ὅπως καὶ τῶν παθῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων συμμέτοχος γενόμενος καὶ ἴασιν ποιήσηται. Comp. Apol. i. 32 : Διʼ αἵματος καθαίρων τοὺς πιστεύοντας αὐτῷ, i. 63 ; dial. c. Tryp. § 40–43, and § 95. Justin also calls the death of Jesus a sacrifice (προσφορά), comp. the passages quoted by *Bähr*, p. 42, and *Semisch*, ii. p. 418, ss. The writings of *Clement of Alexandria* also abound with passages relative to the efficacy of the death of Jesus, Coh. p. 86, comp. *Bähr*, l. c. p. 76, ibid. 88. Pæd. i. 9, p. 148, ii. 2, p. 177, (διττὸν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου), and other passages. A mystical interpretation of the crown of thorns, Pæd. ii. 8, p. 214, 15, (with reference to Hebr. ix. 22), a passage which Bähr has overlooked. In the treatise qu. dives salvus 34, p. 954, the phrase occurs : αἷμα Θεοῦ παιδὸς (not παιδὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ) ; hence the assertion of Bähr (p. 116,) that the Lutheran phrase "*the blood of God,*" would have met with opposition on the part of all the

---

[a] "Inferences may be drawn from these sentiments of Origen, which are not in accordance with the simple truth of Scripture ; but they may also be so interpreted as to agree with the example of wholesome doctrine. *The latter is undoubtedly better and more charitable than the former.*" *Mosheim,* transl. p. 297.

Fathers of this period, cannot be admitted in its full exten Concerning the efficacy of his death, see Strom. iv. 7. 583, and other passages. On the other hand, it is worthy of notice, that Clement, as Philo had done before him, and Origen did after him, applies the idea of the priestly office of Christ in an ideal sense to the Logos, without any reference to the death which he suffered in his human nature, comp. *Bähr*, p. 81.

(3) The fact that the heathen charged the Christians with rendering homage to all that were crucified, (Orig. c. Cels. ii. 47. Opp. i. p. 422,) shows, to say the least, that the latter held the cross in high esteem. On the symbolical signification of the cross, and the earlier fanciful interpretations of the allegorists concerning the blood of Christ, comp. § 29, note 3. On the effects of the cross upon the demons, see § 52, note 4.

(4) "*The notion that the death of Christ represented the victory over the devil, was so agreeable to the entire circle of ideas in which these times moved, that it was very difficult to abandon it.*" *Baur*, l. c. p. 28. He also maintains that this mode of considering the death of Christ was transferred from the Gnostics to the church by simply converting the person of the demiurgus into that of the devil. (?) It is represented in this period by *Irenæus.* His train of reasoning is the following: Man came under the dominion of the devil by violating the Divine commandment. This state of bondage lasted from Adam to Christ. The latter delivers men by rendering perfect obedience on the cross, and paying a ransom with his blood. God did not rescue their souls from the power of the devil by force, as the devil himself had done, but *secundum suadelam* (*i. e.* according to *Baur*, l. c., the devil was himself convinced of the justice of the manner in which he was treated.) But *Duncker*, p. 237, refers the suadela more correctly to man, who was delivered from the power of the devil by the better conviction he had gained through the teaching of Christ. The devil had indeed employed suadela (persuasion) in relation to man, but force in relation to God. Since man voluntarily abandoned the service of the devil, as he had voluntarily placed himself under his sway, the judicial relation in which God stands to man was restored, comp. Iren. adv. Hær. v. 1. 1. From this he infers the necessity of the Saviour's twofold nature (the more Irenæus in this particular point departs from the prevailing notion of the age, the more his views approach those of Anselm in a later period) iii. 18. 7: Ἥνωσεν

ἄνθρωπον τῷ θεῷ. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἄνθρωπος ἐνίκησε τὸν ἀντίπαλον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, οὐκ ἂν δικαίως ἐνικήθη ὁ ἐχθρός, comp. v. 21. 3. iii. 19. 3: Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἵνα πειρασθῆ, οὕτως καὶ λόγος ἵνα δοξασθῇ, etc. (comp. § 65, note 3.) Both the perfect obedience of Christ, and the shedding of his blood as a ransom (v. 1. 1.: Τῷ ἰδίῳ οὖν αἵματι λυτρωσαμένου ἡμᾶς τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ δόντος τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ψυχῶν, καὶ τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀντὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων σαρκῶν, etc.) form in the system of Irenæus the negative aspect of the doctrine of redemption, to which is added the positive one, the communication of a new principle of life, iii. 23. 7. Comp. *Baur*, l. c. p. 30–42. *Bähr*, p. 55–72. On the other hand, the idea of a sacrifice is in his writings kept in the background, see *Duncker*, p. 252.

(5) On the peculiar usage of the term satisfactio, comp. *Münscher*, Handb. i. p. 223. *Bähr*, p. 90, ss. On the question whether *Justin M.* propounded the doctrine of satisfaction, see *Semisch*, p. 423, 424. The answer to it must mainly depend on the interpretation of ὑπέρ, which frequently occurs in his writings, Apol. i. 63; dial. c. Tryph. § 88, and other passages quoted by *Semisch*. The curse under which Christ was laid, was only apparent, dial. c. Tryph. § 90, 93, 95, 96. From *Tert.* de pœn. 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, de pat. 13, de pud. 9, it is evident "*that he applies the term satisfacere to such as make amends for their own sins by confession and repentance which shows itself by works;*" but he never understands by it satisfactio vicaria in the sense which was afterwards attached to it. That Tertullian was far from entertaining such notions, may be proved from de cultu fem. i. 1, and the interpretation which he gives to Gal. iii. 13, contra Judæos 10; he there represents the crime that had been committed, as a curse, but not the hanging on the tree (for Christ was not accursed by God, but by the Jews); thus also contra Marc. v. 5, and other passages which are quoted by *Bähr*, p. 89, ss. In other points his views resemble those of Irenæus, ibid. p. 100–104.

(6) *Origen* held both these notions, that of Irenæus concerning the victory over the devil, which he however represented as an act of deception on the part of God, and that of a voluntary sacrifice. But the latter is not made to satisfy the claims of justice, but must be attributed to the love of God. Comp. *Baur*, p. 43–67. *Bähr*, p. 111, ss. *Thomasius*, p. 214, ss. His interpretation of Is. liii. 3, comes nearest to the view entertained in later times by Anselm, Comment. in Joh. Tom. 28, 14. Opp.

iv. p. 392. *Bähr*, p. 151.[a] But Origen departs from the ecclesiastical doctrine of satisfaction in the manner in which he explains, *e. g.*, the sufferings in the garden of Gethsemane, and the exclamation of Christ on the cross: My God, my God, etc. *Bähr*, p. 147–149.

(7) Comp. the 19. Tom. in Joh. Opp. iv. p. 286. and the passage before quoted from the 28. Tom. p. 393, contra Cels. i. 1, p. 349: Ὅτι ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ἑκὼν τοῦτον τὸν θάνατον ὑπὲρ τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους ἀνεδέξατο, ἀνάλογον τοῖς ἀποθανοῦσι ὑπὲρ πατρίδων ἐπὶ τῷ σβέσαι λοιμικὰ κρατήσαντα καταστήματα ἢ ἀφορίας ἢ δυσπλοίας. These human sacrifices were thought to be connected with the influence exerted by the demons, which was to be removed by them; see *Baur*, p. 45, and *Mosheim*, in a note to the translation of that passage, p. 70.—The death of Christ also gave an additional weight to his *doctrine*, and was the cause of its propagation, Hom. in Jerem. 10. 2, comp. *Bähr*, p. 142, who observes: that no ecclesiastical writer of this period beside Origen distinctly mentions this point. This idea bears indeed the greatest resemblance to the modern rationalistico-moral notions concerning the death of Christ. He also compares the death of Jesus with that of Socrates, contra Cels. ii. 17. Opp. i. p. 403, 4, and regards it as a moral lever to strengthen the courage of his followers, ibid. 40–42, p. 418, 19.

(8) *Clement* already believed that the death of the martyrs in some degree atoned for sin, Strom. iv. 9, p. 596, comp. p. 602. 3, likewise *Orig*. Comm. in Joh. Opp. iv. p. 153, 54, exhort. ad Martyr. 50. Opp. i. p. 309: Τάχα δὲ καὶ ὥσπερ τιμίῳ αἵματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἠγοράσθημεν......οὕτως τῷ τιμίῳ αἵματι τῶν μαρτύρων ἀγορασθήσονταί τινες.

(9) This view rests upon Col. i. 20. Comment. in Joh. i. 40. Opp. iv. p. 41, 42: Οὐ μόνον ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν λοιπῶν λογικῶν. De princ. iv. 25. Opp. i. p. 188. (*Red.* p. 79, and 364.) There are two altars on which sacrifice is made, an earthly and a heavenly one, Hom: in Lev. i. 3. Opp. ii. p. 186. ii. 3. ibid. p. 190, comp. *Bähr*, p. 119, ss. *Bäur*, p. 64. *Thomasius*, p. 214–217. *Redepenning*, Orig. ii. p. 463.

---

[a] But it should not be overlooked that Origen immediately afterwards connects this passage with 1 Cor. iv. 13, and applies to Christ in a *higher degree* what is there said in reference to the Apostles.

From all that has been said in reference to the subject in question, it would follow that the primitive church held the doctrine of vicarious *sufferings*, but not that of vicarious *satisfaction.* But we should not lay too much stress upon the negative aspect of this inference, so as to justify or to identify it with that later interpretation of the death of Jesus, which would exclude everything that is mysterious. Comp. *Bähr*, p. 5—8, and 176—180.

§ 69.

DESCENSUS AD INFEROS.

Dietelmaier, J. A., Historia dogmatis de descensu Christi ad inferos, Altorf. 1762, 8. *Semler, J. A.*, Observatio historico-dogmatica de vario et impari veterum studio in recolenda historia descensus Christi ad inferos, Hal. 1775. *J. Clausen,* dogmatis de descensu Jesu Christi ad inferos historiam biblicam atque ecclesiasticam composuit, Hafn. 1801. Comp. *Pott*, Epp. cath. Exc. iii. [Comp. also, *Pearson*, On the Creed, v. art. and *Heylyn*, on the Creed, vi. art.] *J. L. König*, die Lehre von Christi Höllenfahrt, nach der h. Schrift, der ältesten Kirche, den christlichen Symbolen und nach ihrer viel umfassenden Bedeutung. Frankf. 1842.

We have seen that the Fathers of this period, with the exception of *Origen,* limited the efficacy of Christ's death to this world. But several writers of the second and third centuries thought that it was also retrospective in its effects, and inferred from some allusions in Scripture,(1) that Christ descended in the abode of the dead (Hades), to announce to the souls of the patriarchs, etc. which were there kept, the accomplishment of the work of redemption, and to conduct them with him into his glorious kingdom.(2)

(1) Acts ii. 27, 31. (Rom. x. 6, 7, 8.) Eph. iv. 9. 1 Pet. iii. 19, 20, (in connection with Psalm xvi. 10.)—On the clause descendit ad inferos in the Apostles' creed, which is of later origin, see Rufin. expos. p. 22, (ed. *Fell*) *King*, p. 169, ss. *Pott*, l. c. p. 300. [*Pearson,* l. c. p. 237.]

(2) Apocryphal narrative in the Ev. Nic. c. 17—27. (*Thilo,* Cod. Ap. i. p. 667, ss.) *Ullmann*, historisch oder mythisch? p. 228. An allusion is found in the Testament of the xii patriarchs, *Grabe,* Spic. PP. Sæc. i. p. 250. On the passage in the oration of Thaddeus quoted by Eus. i. 13: Κατέβη εἰς τὸν ᾅδην καὶ διέσχισε

φραγμὸν τὸν ἐξ αἰῶνος μὴ σχισθέντα, καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ συνήγειρε νεκροὺς τοὺς ἀπ' αἰώνων κεκοιμημένους, καὶ πῶς κατέβη μόνος, ἀνέβη δὲ μετὰ πολλοῦ ὄχλου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ, comp. *Vales.*—The passage from the longer edition of *Ign.* Ep. ad. Trall. c. 9. ii. p. 64, is doubtful; and that from the Shepherd of *Hermas*, Sim. ix. c. 16, refers more properly to the Apostles. *Justin M.* also supposes that Christ preached in the nether world, dial. c. Tryph. § 72. Comp. *Semisch*, ii. p. 414. More definite is the language of *Iren.* iv. 27, (45.) p. 264, (347.) v. 31, p. 331, (451.) *Tert.* de an. 7, and 55. *Clem.* Strom. vi. 6, p. 762—67. and ii. 9, p. 452, (where he quotes the passage from Hermas;) the latter is inclined to extend the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. *Orig.* contra Cels. ii. 43. Opp. i. p. 419, in libr. Reg. Hom. ii. Opp. ii. p. 492—98, especially towards the close. Comp. *König.* p. 97. Among the heretics we may mention the opinion of Marcion, that Christ did not deliver the patriarchs, but Cain, the people of Sodom, and all those who had been condemned by the demiurgus. Iren. i. 27, (29.) p. 106, (Gr. 104.) [On the opinions of the Fathers, comp. also *Pearson*, l. c. p. 239, 245, ss., and *Heylyn*, l. c. p. 264, ss.]

§ 70.

THE ECONOMY OF REDEMPTION.

Heubner, H. L., historia antiquior dogmatis de modo salutis tenendæ et justificationis, etc. Wittemb. 1805. 4.

From what has been said in the preceding section, it is evident that the primitive church generally believed that Jesus Christ was the only way of salvation, and the Mediator between God and man. But all men were required to appropriate to themselves, by a free and independent act, the blessings which Christ has obtained for them, and is willing to bestow upon every one.(1) The forgiveness of sins was made dependent both on true repentance,(2) and the performance of good works.(3) It is to be regretted, that the Fathers, in treating of this subject, sometimes used language which might easily be interpreted as favourable to the doctrine of the meritoriousness of good works.(4) Nevertheless all agreed in making *faith* (in accordance with the apostolic doctrine) the conditio sine qua non of salvation,(5) and acknowledged that it alone possesses the power of making men happy by bringing about an intimate union (unio mystica) between them and God.(6) Though the will of man was generally admitted to be free, yet it was also felt that it must be assisted by Divine grace,(7) and thus gradually arose the idea of an eternal decree of God, (*predestination*), which however was not yet thought to be unconditional.(8) *Origen,* in particular, endeavoured to explain the relation of predestination to the freedom of the human will in such a manner as should not endanger the latter.(9)

---

(1) This follows from the above passages on human liberty. *Justin M.*, dial. c Tryph. § 95: Εἰ μετανοοῦντες ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις καὶ ἐπιγνόντες τοῦτον εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ φυλάσσοντες αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐντολὰς ταῦτα φήσετε, ἄφεσις ὑμῖν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὅτι ἔσται, προεῖπον. Comp. *Orig.* contra Cels. iii. 28. Opp. i. p. 465, (in connection with what was mentioned § 68), according to which every one who *lives* in compliance with the precepts of Christ, obtains through him friendship with God, and is vitally united to him.

(2) The very circumstance that, in the opinion of the primitive church, sins committed *after* baptism are less easily pardoned (Clem. Strom. iv. 24. p. 634. Sylb. 536. C.), and the entire ecclesiastical discipline of the first ages prove this.—As regards μετάνοια, *Clement* was aware of the distinction afterwards made between contritio and attritio, Strom. iv. 6, p. 580: Τοῦ μετανοοῦντος δὲ τρόποι δύο· ὁ μὲν κοινότερος, φόβος ἐπὶ τοῖς πραχθεῖσιν, ὁ δὲ ἰδιαίτερος, ἡ δυσωπία ἡ πρὸς ἑαυτὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκ συνειδήσεως.—On μετάνοια comp. also Pæd. i. 9. 146. and quis div. salv. 40. p. 957.

(3) *Hermas,* Pastor. iii. 7: Oportet eum, qui agit pœnitentiam, affligere animam suam et humilem animo se præstare in omni negotio et vexationes multas variasque perferre. *Justin M.* also lays great stress upon the external manifestation of repentance by tears, etc. dial. c. Tryph. § 141. *Cypr.* de opere et eleem. p. 167. (237 Bal.): Loquitur in scripturis divinis Spir. S. et dicit (Prov. xv. 29.): Eleemosynis et fide delicta purgantur. Non

utique illa delicta, quæ fuerunt ante contracta, nam illa Christi sanguine et sanctificatione purgantur. Item denuo dicit (Eccles. iii. 33.): Sicut aqua extinguit ignem, sic eleemosyna extinguit peccatum. Hic quoque ostenditur et probatur, quia sicut lavacro aquæ salutaris gehennæ ignis extinguitur, ita eleemosynis atque operationibus justis delictorum flamma sopitur. Et quia semel in baptismo remissa peccatorum datur, assidua et jugis operatio baptismi instar imitata Dei rursus indulgentiam largitur (with a further appeal to Luke xi. 41.) Tears are also of great importance, Ep. 31, p. 64. Rettb. p. 323, 389. *Origen*, Hom. in Lev. ii. 4. Opp. ii. p. 190, 91, enumerates 7 remissiones peccatorum: 1. that which is granted in baptism; 2. that which is obtained by martyrdom; 3. by alms, (Luke xi. 41); 4. by forgiveness which we grant to those who have trespassed against us, (Matth. vi. 14); 5. by the conversion of others, (James v. 20); 6. by exceeding great love, (Luke vii. 47; 1 Pet. iv. 8); 7. by pennance and repentance: Est adhuc et septima, licet dura et laboriosa, per pœnitentiam remissio peccatorum, cum lavat peccator in lacrymis stratum suum, et fiunt ei lacrymæ suæ panes die ac nocte, et cum non erubescit sacerdoti Domini indicare peccatum suum et quærere medicinam. On the merit of the martyrs, comp. § 68. The intercession of confessors yet living is opposed by *Tert.* de pud. 22. *Cyprian* also limits their influence to the day of judgment, de lapsis p. 129, (187.)—*Concerning a first and second penance*, see *Hermæ* Pastor. Mand. iv. 3. *Clem*. Strom. ii. 13, p. 459: Καὶ οὐκ οἶδ᾽ ὁπότερον αὐτοῖν χεῖρον ἢ τὸ εἰδότα ἁμαρτάνειν ἢ μετανοήσαντα ἐφ᾽ οἷς ἥμαρτεν πλημμελεῖν αὖθις. The different views of Tertullian *before* and *after* his conversion to Montanism may be seen by comparing de pœnit. 7. with de pud. 18. On the controversy between Cyprian and the Novatians see the works on ecclesiastical history.

(4) Traces of the doctrine of supererogatory works (opera supererogatoria) are found in the Shepherd of *Hermas*, Simil. Lib. iii. 5. 3: Si præter ea quæ non mandavit Dominus aliquod boni adjeceris, majorem dignitatem tibi conquires et honoratior apud Dominum eris, quam eras futurus. *Origen* speaks in a similar manner, Ep. ad Rom. Lib. iii. Opp. T. iv. p. 507, (he makes a subtile distinction between the *unprofitable* servant, Luke xvii. 10, and the *good* and *faithful* servant, Matth, xxv. 21, and appeals to 1 Cor. vii. 25, concerning the virgins.)

(5) During the present period, in which the attention of men

was principally directed to theoretical knowledge, *faith* was for the most part considered as historico-dogmatic faith in its relation to γνῶσις, (comp. § 34.) This gave rise to the opinion that knowledge in Divine things justifies, while ignorance condemns. *Minucius* Fel. 35: Imperitia Dei sufficit ad pœnam, notitia prodest ad veniam. *Theophilus* of Antioch also knows of a fides historica alone, upon which he makes salvation to depend, i. 14: Ἀπόδειξιν οὖν λαβὼν τῶν γινομένων καὶ προαναπεφωνημένων, οὐκ ἀπιστῶ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύω πειθαρχῶν θεῷ, ᾧ εὐ βούλει καὶ σὺ ὑποτάγηθι, πιστεύων αὐτῷ, μὴ νῦν ἀπισθήσας, πεισθῆς ἀνιώμενος τότε ἐν αἰωνίοις τιμωρίαις. But though it was reserved for men of later times to investigate more profoundly the idea of justifying faith in the Pauline sense, yet correct views on this subject were not entirely wanting during this period, comp. Clem. Rom. Ep. i. ad Cor. 37–39. *Tertull.* adv. Marc. v. 3; Ex fidei libertate justificatur homo, non ex legis servitute, quia justus ex fide vivit. According to *Clement* of Alexandria *faith* is not only the key to the knowledge of God (Coh. p. 9), but by it we are also made the children of God, ib. p. 23. (comp. § 68, note 1), p. 69. Clement accurately distinguishes between theoretical and practical unbelief, and understands by the latter the want of susceptibility of Divine impressions, a carnal mind which would have everything in a tangible shape, Strom. ii. 4, p. 436.—Origen in Num. Hom. xxvi. Opp. iii. p. 369: Impossibile est salvari sine fide. Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. Opp. iv. p. 517: Etiamsi opera quis habeat ex lege, tamen, quia non sunt ædificata supra fundamentum fidei, quamvis videantur esse bona, tamen operatorem suum justificare non possunt, quod eis deest fides, quæ est signaculum eorum, qui justificantur a Deo.

(6) *Clement*, Coh. p. 90: Ὦ τῆς ἁγίας καὶ μακαρίας ταύτης δυνάμεως, δι' ἧς ἀνθρώποις συμπολιτεύεται Θεός κ. τ. λ. Quis. div. salv. p. 951: Ὅσον γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ τις τὸν Θεὸν, τοσούτῳ καὶ πλέον ἐνδοτέρῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παραδύεται. Ideal quietism, Pæd. i. 13, p. 160: Τέλος δέ ἐστι θεοσεβείας ἡ αΐδιος ἀνάπαυσις ἐν τῷ Θεῷ. Comp. iii. 7, p. 277, 78, (in reference to riches in God), Strom. ii. 16, p. 467, 68. iv. 22, p. 627, 630.

(7) *Tert.* ad uxor. i. 8: Quædam sunt divinæ liberalitatis, quædam nostræ operationis. Quæ a Domino indulgentur, sua gratia gubernantur; quæ ab homine captantur, studio perpetrantur, cf. de virg. vel. 10, de patient. 1. adv. Hermog. 5. *Justin M.* and *Clement* of Alexandria look favourably at Synergism. Comp. Just. Apol. i. 10. Dial. c. Tr. § 32. Coh. i. 99.

Strom. V. 13, p. 696. vii. 7, p. 860: *Ὡς δὲ ὁ ἰατρὸς ὑγεἰαν παρέχεται τοῖς συνεργοῦσι πρὸς ὑγείαν, οὕτως καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τὴν αΐδιον σωτηρίαν τοῖς συνεργοῦσι πρὸς γνῶσίν τε καὶ εὐπραγίαν.* Quis. div. salv. p. 947: Βουλομέναις μὲν γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ταῖς ψυχαῖς συνεπιπνεῖ. and thus *Orig*. Hom. in Ps. Opp. T. ii. p. 571: Τὸ τοῦ λογικοῦ ἀγαθὸν μικτόν ἐστιν ἔκ τε τῆς προαιρέσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς συμπνεούσης θείας δυνάμεως τῷ τὰ κάλλιστα προελομένῳ, comp. de princ. iii. 1. 18. Opp. i. p 129, and 22, p. 137 (on Rom. ix. 16, and the apparent contradiction between 2 Tim. ii. 20, 21, and Rom. ix. 21.) *Cyprian*, de gratia Dei ad Donat. p. 3, 4: Ceterum si tu innocentiæ, si justitiæ viam teneas, si illapsa firmitate vestigii tui incedas, si in Deum viribus totis ac toto corde suspensus, hoc sis tantum quod esse cœpisti, tantum tibi ad licentiam datur, quantum gratiæ spiritalis augetur. Non enim, qui beneficiorum terrestrium mos est, in capessendo munere cœlesti mensura ulla vel modus est: profluens largiter spiritus nullis finibus premitur, nec cœrcentibus claustris intra certa metarum spatia frænatur, manat jugiter, exuberat affluenter. Nostrum tantum sitiat pectus et pateat; quantum illuc fidei capacis afferimus, tantum gratiæ inundantis haurimus. De Orat. dom. p. 144, (208.) adv. Jud. iii. 25, ss., p. 72, 42, ss., p. 77, ss.

(8) *Hermas* represented the predestination of God as dependent on his *foreknowledge*, Lib. iii. Simil. 8. 6, likewise *Justin M.* Dial. c. Tryph. § 141. *Iren.* iv. 29. 2, p. 267. *Minuc. Fel.* c. 36. *Tert.* adv. Marc. ii. 23. *Clem. Al.* Pæd. i. 6, p. 114.: Οἶδεν οὖν (ὁ Θεὸς) οὓς κέκληκεν, οὓς σέσωκεν. According to Strom. vi. p. 763, it is men's own fault if they are not elected. They resemble those who voluntarily jump out of the vessel into the sea. "*Thus the practical disposition of Cyprian was opposed to the doctrine of rigid predestination, of irresistible grace; he could not so readily and so boldly admit all the consequences which are found in the stupendous fabric of Augustine's system.*" —"*That the bishop of Hippo nevertheless thought to have discovered his own orthodoxy in the writings of Cyprian, may perhaps be ascribed to his eager desire to see the principles which he so zealously defended, confirmed by the opinions of others.*" *Rettberg*, p. 321.

(9) *Origen* is far from believing in the doctrine of reprobation. De princ. iii. 1. Opp. i. p. 115. (Redep. p. 20,) he calls those heterodox who adduce the passage relative to the hardening of Pharaoh's heart, and other passages of the Old Test. of similar

import in opposition to the αὐτεξούσιον of the human soul. He explains God's dealings with Pharaoh from physical analogies: the rain falls upon different kinds of soil, and causes different plants to grow; the sun both melts wax, and hardens clay. Even in common life it sometimes happens that a good master says to his lazy servant whom he has spoiled by indulgence: I have spoiled you. But he does not mean to say, that such was his intention. Origen (as *Schleiermacher* did in later times) perceives in what is called reprobatio only a longer delay of the grace of God. As a physician often employs those remedies which apparently produce bad effects, but heal the disease radically, instead of using such as would effect a speedy cure, so God acts in his dealings with men; he has prepared their souls not only for this short passing life, but for eternity, ibid. p. 121. (*Redep.* p. 26.) He adduces a similar illustration from the husbandman (according to Matth. xiii. 8), and then goes on) p. 123: "Ἄπειροι γὰρ ἡμῖν, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, αἱ ψυχαὶ, καὶ ἄπειρα τὰ τούτων ἤθη καὶ πλεῖστα ὅσα τὰ κινήματα καὶ αἱ προθέσεις καὶ ἐπιβολαὶ καὶ αἱ ὁρμαὶ, ὧν εἷς μόνος οἰκονόμος ἄριστος, καὶ τοὺς καιροὺς ἐπιστάμενος, καὶ τὰ ἁρμόζοντα βοηθήματα καὶ τὰς ἀγωγὰς καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς, ὁ τῶν ὅλων θεὸς καὶ πατήρ. See ibid. the interpretation of Ezek. xi. 19, and other passages. On the connection subsisting between Origen's doctrine of predestination and his doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul, comp. de princ. ii. 9, 7. Opp. i. p. 99. (Red. p. 220,) in reference to Jacob and Esau. Origen also held, like the other Fathers prior to the time of Augustine, that predestination was dependent on foreknowledge, Philoc. c. 25, on Rom. viii. 28, 29, (quoted by *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, i. p. 369.)

FIFTH SECTION.

THE CHURCH AND HER MEANS OF GRACE.

§ 71.

THE CHURCH.

Henke, H. Th. C., historia antiquior dogmatis de unitate ecclesiæ. Helmst. 1781. †*Möhler*, die Einheit der Kirche. Tüb. 1825. **Rothe, Rich.*, die Entwickelung des Begriffs der Kirche in ihrem ersten Stadium. (The third book of his work: die Anfänge der christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung. Wittenb. 1837. i. vol.) *Gess*, die Einheit der Kirche im Sinn Cyprians (in den Studien der evangelischen Geistlichkeit Würtembergs. Stuttgart, 1838, ii. 1. p. 147.) *Huther*, Cyprian, comp. § 26, note 9. *Schenkel*, see § 30. In reference to Rothe's work: *Petersen, A.*, die Idee der christlichen Kirche. Lpzg. 1839–44. 3 vols. 8.

A holy Catholic Christian church which is the communion of saints, was the expression used in the Christian confession of faith to denote the feeling of Christian fellowship which prevailed in the primitive church, though no distinct definitions concerning the nature of the church are found previous to the time of Cyprian.(1) Among the many images under which the church was represented, none was so frequently employed as that of a mother, or of Noah's ark. The Fathers uniformly asserted, both in opposition to heretics, and to all who were not Christians, that there is no salvation out of the church, but that all the fulness of the Divine grace is to be found in it.(2) *Clement of Alexandria* in particular, and still more strongly *Cyprian*, maintain the unity of the church.(3) The definitions of the latter, who takes a more practical position, are of great importance in the history of this doctrine. But he did not sufficiently distinguish between the historico-empirical, visible existence of the church and the idea of a church which is above the change of mere forms, and gradually developes itself to a state of higher perfection. This is shown by the Novatian controversy. Thus it happened, that the apostolico-Christian doctrine of a universal priesthood was more and more superseded by the hierarchy of the bishops and the internal was converted into the external.(4) The false idealism of the Gnostics, and the heretical and schismatical tendencies of separate sects, especially of the Montanists and the followers of Novatian, form a striking contrast with this false external unity of the Catholic church.(5)

(1) " *The general character of the earlier period (previous to the time of Cyprian) is that of abstract indefiniteness. What the theologians of this period say concerning the nature of the church is so frequently void of clearness and precision, that it is almost impossible fully to ascertain their real sentiments on this point; it is nothing uncommon to see the same Fathers evading, or even rejecting consequences which necessarily follow from their general reasonings. They thus evince a fickleness (?) which prevents us from forming any decided and certain opinion as to their ideas of the nature of the church.*" *Rothe*, l. c. p. 575.

(2) On the term ἐκκλησία in general (corresponding to the Hebrew יְהוָֹה, קְהַל, עֲדַת, מִקְרָא) comp. *Suicer*, thes. sub voce. *Rothe*, p. 74, ss. The phrase ἐκκλησία καθολική first occurs in the inscription of the Ep. Smyrn. de mart. Polycarpi about the year 169, Eus. iv. 15. Comp. *Ign.* ad Smyrn. 8: Ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία. How great an importance the Fathers were accustomed to attribute to the church, may be seen from *Irenæus*, adv. hær. iii. 4. 1, and iii. 24. (40.) The *church* alone contains all the riches of truth: out of her there are nothing but thieves and robbers, pools with foul water: Ubi enim ecclesia, ibi et spiritus Dei, ubi spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia, (comp. *Huther*, l. c. p. 4, 5,) iv. 31, 3, according to which the pillar of salt into which the wife of Lot was transformed, represents the durability of the church, and other passages (comp. § 34, notes 1. and 2.) *Clement* of Alexandria derives the term and the idea of ἐκκλησία from the elect

forming a society, Coh. p. 69, and Pæd. i. 6, p. 114: Ὡς γὰρ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ἔργον ἔστὶ καὶ τοῦτο κόσμος ὀνομάζεται· οὕτως καὶ τὸ βούλημα αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ σωτηρία· καὶ τοῦτο Ἐκκλησία κέκληται· οἶδεν οὖν οὓς κέκληκεν, οὓς σέσωκεν. Comp. Strom. vii. 5, p. 846: Οὐ γὰρ νῦν τὸν τόπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἄθροισμα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν Ἐκκλησίαν καλῶ κ. τ. λ. Clement describes the church as a mother, Pæd. i. 5, p. 110, even as both a mother and a virgin, c. 6, p. 123; in speaking of this subject he indulges in allegories, p. 111, ss. The church is the *body* of the Lord, Strom. vii. 14, p. 885. Comp. p. 899, 900, (765 Sylb.) Though Clement asserts that only the *true* Gnostics (οἱ ἐν τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ) form the church, yet he does not so much contrast with them *those* who have only *faith*, as the heretics who have nothing but an *opinion* (οἴησις), and the heathen who live in total ignorance (ἄγνοια), Strom. vii. 16, p. 894, (760 Sylb.) *Origen* also, though, generally speaking, he judges mildly of heretical or sectarian opinions, (contra Cels. iii. § 10–13), asserts that there is no salvation out of the church, Hom. iii. in Josuam, Opp. ii. p. 404: Nemo semetipsum decipiat, extra hanc domum, *i. e.* extra ecclesiam nemo salvetur, and Selecta in Hiob. ibid. iii. p. 501, 502. Concerning the views of *Tertullian* we must make a distinction between those which he held prior, and those which he entertained anterior to his conversion to Montanism. Comp. *Neander*, Antign. p. 264, ss. The principal passages relative to his earlier opinions are: de præscript. c. 21, ss. 32, 35, de bapt. c. 8, de orat. c. 2, where the above images are carried out at some length, (see *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 70.) Thus *Cyprian*, Ep. 4, p. 9; Neque enim vivere foris possunt, cum domus Dei una sit, et nemini salus esse, nisi in ecclesia possit. He too adduces a variety of similar images. Comp. note 3.

"*The common opinion that the proposition:* quod extra ecclesia nulla salus, *or:* de ecclesia, extra quam nemo potest esse salvus, *was for the first time laid down by Augustine in the Donatist controversy, is incorrect. It was only the necessary consequence and application of earlier principles, and was distinctly implied in the form which the doctrine of the church had assumed since the time of Irenæus. Hence we find in the writings of the latter many allusions to it, though he does not make use of the somewhat harsh phrase given above. But it is almost to be regretted that both this idea and phrase have entirely disappeared in the present age, inasmuch as they express a profound truth, and might with equal propriety be used by all parties in the church. For life and happiness are only to be found in religion, and out of it there is nothing but death and misery.*" *Marheineke* (in Daub und Creuzers Studien, iii. p. 187.)

(3) On the *unity* of the church see *Clem.* Al. Pæd. i. 4, p. 103. c. 6, p. 123: Ὦ θαύματος μυστικοῦ· εἷς μὲν ὁ τῶν ὅλων πατήρ· εἷς δὲ καὶ ὁ τῶν ὅλων λόγος· καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πανταχοῦ· μία δὲ μόνη γίνεται μήτηρ παρθένος κ. τ. λ. Strom. i. 18, p. 375. vii. 6, p. 848, and other passages. Concerning the opinion of *Tertull.* comp. the passages before cited. *Cyprian* wrote a separate work on the doctrine of the *unity* of the church about the year 251: de unitate ecclesiæ, with which several of his extant letters (see note 4) may be compared. He adds some new images to those used by Tertullian, as illustrative of this unity: the sun which casts forth many rays, the tree with its many branches, all of which derive their nourishment and strength from the *one* root, the *one* source which gives rise to many brooks: Avelle radium solis a corpore, divisionem lucis unitas non capit; ab arbore frange ramum, fractus germinare non poterit; a fonte præcide rivum, præcisus arescet. Sic ecclesia Domini luce perfusa per orbem totum radios suos porrigit, etc.—He also treats at great length of the image of the *one* mother: Illius fœtu nascimur, illius lacte nutrimur, spiritu ejus animamur. He who has not the church for his mother, has no longer God for his father (de unit. eccles. 5, 6.) According to the usage of the Old Test. faithlessness towards the church is compared to adultery. The trinity itself is an image of the unity of the church (comp. Clement, l. c.) as well as the coat of Christ which was not to be rent, the passover which had to be eaten in *one* house, the *one* dove in Solomon's Song, the house of Rahab which was *alone* preserved, etc. Quite in consistence with such notions, he maintains that martyrdom out of the church, so far from being meritorious, is rather an aggravation of sin: Esse martyr non potest, qui in ecclesia non est. . . Occidi talis potest, coronari non potest, etc. Comp. *Rettb.* 241, ss., p. 355, ss., p. 367, ss. *Huther,* p. 52–59. (Comp. the passages quoted by *Münscher,* l. c. p. 70, ss.)

(4) If the genuineness of the epistles of Ignatius (even of the shorter recension) were fully established, they would prove beyond all dispute, that submission to the bishops was considered as a *doctrine* of the church at a very early period. Comp. Ep. ad Smyrn. c. 8: Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρί, etc. ad Polyc. c. 6: [Τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν,] ad Eph. c. 4: [Πρέπει ὑμῖν συντρέχειν τῇ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου γνώμῃ, ὅπερ καὶ ποιεῖτε. Τὸ γὰρ ἀξιονόμαστον ὑμῶν πρεσβυτέριον, τοῦ θεοῦ ἄξιον, οὕτως συνήρμοσται τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ὡς χορδαὶ κιθάρᾳ.] ad Magn. c. 6, 7. ad Philad.

c. 7. ad Trall. c. 2: [Ἀναγκαῖον οὖν ἔστιν...ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν πράσσειν ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὑποτάσσασθε καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ.] Comp. *Rothe*, p. 445, ss. *Iren.* iii. 14. iv. 26, (43.) v. 20. On the succession of the bishops: iii. 3. (primacy of the Romish church); comp. with it *Neander*, i. 3, p. 318, note. Though *Tertullian* appeared formerly willing, de præscr. c. 32, to concede to the church of Rome the precedence over other churches, yet after his conversion to Montanism he combated the pretensions of the Romish bishops, de pud. 21; he there alludes particularly to the words of Christ addressed to Peter: dabo tibi claves ecclesiæ—and maintains that the word *tibi* refers to Peter alone. and not to the bishops. He supposed that spiritually minded men were the successors of Peter, and distinguished between the ecclesia spiritus per spiritales homines (in which the trinity dwells), and *that* ecclesia which is composed of the sum total of the bishops (numerus episcoporum.) On this ground (but not in the purely apostolic sense) he defended the idea of a spiritual priesthood. *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 258–59, and p. 272. On the contrary, *Cyprian* conceives the true priestly dignity to consist in the very *episcopal* power (but not so much in that of the Romish bishops exclusively, as in that of all the bishops collectively,) and thinks that the unity of the church is represented by the successors of the apostles. Hence he who does not take the part of the bishop, no more belongs to the church. Comp. especially the following epistles: 45, 52, 55, 64, 66, 67, 69, 74, 76, (c. 2.) see *Huther*, p. 59, ss. *Rettberg*, p. 367, ss. *Gess*, p. 150, ss. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, i. 1, p. 404–7.

(7) Wherever the term ἐκκλησία occurs in the Clementine Homilies (Hom. iii. 60, 65, 67, p. 653, ss., vii. 8, p. 680. *Credner*, iii. p. 308. *Baur*, p. 373,) it is to be understood in a limited sense. Concerning the Ebionites Epiphanius observes, Hær. 30. 18, p. 142: Συναγωγὴν δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκκλησίαν. Comp. *Credner*, ii. p. 236. The Ebionitic tendency converted the idea of the church into that of a Jewish sect, the Gnostics refined it into an idealistic world of æons (*Baur*, p. 172); on the one hand, we have a body without life, on the other, a phantom without body. For the views of the Montanists concerning the church (vera, pudica, sancta, virgo: *Tertull.* de pudic. 1), which, as a spiritual church, is composed of homines pneumatici, see *Schwegler*, Montanismus, p. 47, ss. 229, ss. The Montanists made no distinction between the *visi-*

ble and *invisible* church, but prepared the way for it. See *Schwegler*, p. 232.

§ 72.

BAPTISM.

Voss, G. J., de baptismo. disputt. xx. Opp. Amstel. 1701. fol. T. vi. *Matthies, C. St.*, baptismatis expositio biblica, historica, dogmatica. Berol. 1831. *Walch, J. G.*, Historia pædobaptismi 4 priorum sæcul. Jen. 1739. 4. (Misc. sacr. Amstel. 1744. 4.) [*Robinson*, the History of Baptism. Lond. 1790. *Halley, R.*, The Sacraments. P. I. Baptism. Lond. 1844.] *J. W. F. Höfling*, das Sacrament der Taufe, nebst an dem damit zusammenhängenden Acten der Initiation. Erl. 1846. 1. 2.

The doctrine of the church stands in intimate connection with the doctrine of *baptism*. From the earliest times great importance was attached to the latter, because of its supposed relation to the forgiveness of sin and to regeneration.(1) Some of the Fathers, especially *Irenæus, Tertullian*, and *Cyprian*, in treating of this subject, as well as of the doctrine of the church, often indulge in exaggerated language, in fanciful and absurd allegories, and in symbolical interpretations,(2) while *Origen* draws a more distinct line between the external sign, and the internal thing which it is meant to teach.(3) —Infant baptism had not come into general use prior to the time of *Tertullian*. Though a strenuous advocate of the doctrine of original sin, that Father, nevertheless, opposed pædo-baptism, on the ground that those who have not committed any actual transgression, need no cleansing from sin.(4) *Origen*, on the contrary, pronounced in favour of infant-baptism.(5) In the time of *Cyprian* it became so general in the African church, that the African bishop *Fidus*, appealing to the analogous rite of circumcision under the Old Test. dispensation, proposed to delay the performance of the ceremony of baptism to the eighth day. Cyprian, however, did not give his consent to this innovation.(6) The baptism of newly converted persons was yet frequently deferred till the approach of death (Baptismus Clinicorum.) (7)—During this period a question arose, which was intimately connected with the doctrine of the nature of the church, viz. whether the baptism of heretics was to be accounted valid, or whether a heretic who returned to the Catholic church was to be rebaptized? In opposition to the usage of the Eastern and African churches, which was defended by *Cyprian*, the principle was established in the Romish church under *Stephen*, that the rite of baptism, if duly performed, was always valid, and its repetition contrary to the tradition of the church (*i. e.* the Romish church.) (8) Baptism was entirely rejected by some Gnostic sects, while it was held in high esteem by the Marcionites and Valentinus. But the mode of baptism which they adopted was altogether different from that of the Catholic church, and founded upon quite another principle.(9) The idea of a *baptism of blood* originated with martyrdom, and was in accordance with the mind of the age.(10)

(1) Concerning the baptism of Christ and of the Apostles, comp. the works on biblical theology, and in reference to the mode of baptism, (immersion, formula, etc.) see the works on archæology. *Augusti*, vol. vii. On the terms: βάπτισμα, βαπτισμός, λοῦτρον, φωτισμός, σφραγίς, and others, comp. the Lexicons. Respecting baptism as it was practised previous to the appearance of Christ, see *Schneckenburger*, über das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe und deren Zusammenhang mit dem johanneischen und christlichen Ritus, Berlin, 1828, where the literature is given, and [*Halley, R.*, Lectures on the Sacraments, P. i. Baptism, p. 111–161.]

(2) On the supernatural influence which the author of the Clementine Homilies ascribes to water, in connection with the notions widely spread in the East, comp. *e. g.* Hom. ix. and x. see *Baur*, Gnos. p. 372. *Credner*, l. c. ii. p. 236, and iii. p. 303. Concerning the Ebionites it is said by Epiph. Indicul. ii. p. 53: Τὸ ὕδωρ ἀντὶ θεοῦ ἔχουσι, comp. Hær. 30. Together with the symbolical interpretation of the cross we find in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers a symbolical interpretation of water:

Barn. 11. *Hermas*, Pastor Vis. iii. 3. Mand. iv. 3. Simil. ix. 6. *Justin M.* (Apol. i. 61,) contrasts baptismal regeneration with natural birth, ἐξ ὑγρᾶς σπορᾶς. By the latter we become τέκνα ἀνάγκης ἀγνοίας; by the former τέκνα προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, ἀφέσεώς τε ἁμαρτιῶν; hence the λοῦτρον is also called φωτισμός. Comp. Dial. c. Tr. c. 13 and 14, where mention is made of the antithesis between baptism and Jewish lustrations. *Theoph.* ad Aut. ii. 16, interprets the blessing which God pronounced on the fifth day of the work of creation upon the creatures of the water, as referring to the water used in baptism. *Clement of Alexandria*, Pæd. i. 6, p. 113, connects the baptism of Christians with the baptism of Jesus. He became τέλειος only by it. And so it is with us: Βαπτιζόμενοι φυτιζόμεθα, φωτιζόμενοι υἱοποιούμεθα, υἱοποιούμενοι τελειούμεθα, τελειούμενοι ἀπαθανατιζόμεθα. Baptism is a χάρισμα. Comp. also p. 116, 117, where the baptized, in allusion to the cleansing power of water, are called διυλιζόμενοι (filtered.) Inasmuch as a connection is brought about between the element and the Logos, or his power and spirit, he calls baptism also ὕδωρ λογικόν, Coh. p. 79. All former lustrations are abolished by baptism, being all included in it, Strom. iii. 12, p. 548, 49. *Iren.* iii. 17, (19,) p. 208, (224.) As dough cannot be made of dry flour, without the addition of some fluid, so we, the many, cannot be united in one body in Christ without the connecting element of water which comes down from heaven; and as the earth is quickened and rendered fruitful by dew and rain, so Christianity by the heavenly water, etc. Tertullian has written a separate treatise on this subject, entitled: de baptismo. Though he rejects the notion of a purely supernatural and mechanical forgiveness of sins by baptism, (comp. *Neander*, Antign. p. 215), yet he takes occasion from the cosmical and psychical significance of water to adduce numerous analogies. Water (felix sacramentum aquæ nostræ, qua abluti delictis pristinæ cæcitatis in vitam æternam liberamur!) is in his view the element in which Christians alone feel at home, as the small fishes which follow the great fish (ΙΧΘΥΣ.) Heretics, on the contrary, are the generation of vipers and snakes that cannot live in fresh water. Water is of great importance in the universe. The spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters—so upon the waters of baptism. As the church is compared with the ark, so the water of baptism is contrasted with the deluge, and the dove of Noah is a type of the dove of the Spirit.[a] As power is inherent in all water, it is indifferent what kind of water is used. The water of the Tiber possesses the same power as the water of Jordan, running produces the same effects as standing water, de bapt. 4: Omnes aquæ de pristina originis prærogativa sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supervenit enim statim Spiritus de cœlis et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso et ita sanctificatæ vim sanctificandi combibunt. Cyprian spoke of the great importance of baptismal water from his own experience, de Grat. ad Donat. p. 3. He does not indeed maintain that water purifies *as such*, (peccata enim purgare et hominem sanctificare aqua sola non potest, nisi habeat et Spiritum S. Ep. 74, p. 213), but his language leads us to suppose that he too believed in the supernatural efficacy of water. The devil was cast out of Pharaoh, when he and all his host were drowned in the Red Sea, (the sea is a symbol of baptism, according to 1 Cor. x.); for the power of the devil does not extend itself over water. As scorpions and snakes lose their strength, and must vomit their poison when thrown into water, so the unclean spirits. In short, whenever water is mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures, the allegorical interpretation is at once applied to it—*it is, therefore, not at all surprising, that the rock in the wilderness, as well as the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well, and many others, are regarded as types of baptism." Rettberg*, p. 332.

(3) The term σύμβολον itself, which *Origen* uses adv. Cels. iii. Opp. i. p. 481, and Comment. in Joh. Opp. iv. p. 132, indicates that he had a more or less distinct idea of the difference between the image and the thing which it represents. Nevertheless (οὐδὲν ἧττον) from the last mentioned passage it is evident, that he also considers baptism as something κατ' αὐτό, viz. ἀρχὴ καὶ πηγὴ χαρισμάτων θείων, because it is administered in the name of the divine Trias. Comp. Hom. in Luc. xxi. Opp. i. p. 957.

(4) The passages from Scripture which are thought to intimate that infant-baptism had come into use in the primitive

---

[a] Concerning these manifold allegorical interpretations of fish, dove, etc. comp. *Münter*, Sinnbilder der Christen, and *Augusti* in his essay: "Die Kirchenthiere" in vol. xii. of his work on the Antiquities of the Christian church. But Tertullian rightly says in reference to himself: Vereor, ne laudes aquæ potius quam baptismi rationes videar congregasse!

church, are doubtful and prove nothing; viz. Mark x. 14. Matth. xviii. 4. 6. Acts ii. 38, 39, 41. Acts x. 48. 1 Cor. i. 16. Col. ii. 11, 12. Nor does the earliest passage occurring in the writings of the Fathers, *Iren.* adv. hær. ii. 22. 4, p. 147, (see § 68, note 1,) afford any decisive proof. It only expresses the beautiful idea that Jesus was Redeemer *in* every stage of life, and *for* every stage of life; but it does not say that he redeemed children by the *water of baptism*, unless the term renasci be interpreted by the most arbitrary petitio principii to refer to baptism. Nor does the passage in question go to prove the contrary. But from the opposition which *Tertullian* raised to infant-baptism, de bapt. 18, it may be inferred that it was a customary practice in his times. He alleges the following reasons against it:—1. The importance of baptism; not even earthly goods are intrusted to those under age; 2. The consequent responsibility of the sponsors; 3. The innocence of children (quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?); 4. The necessity of being previously instructed in religion. (Ait quidem Dominus: nolite eos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant ergo dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant docentur; fiant Christiani cum Christum nosse potuerint); 5. The great responsibility which the subject of baptism takes upon him (Si qui pondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem, quam dilationem.) From the last mentioned reason he recommends even to grown up persons, (single persons, widows, etc.) to delay baptism till they have either married, or formed the firm resolution to live a single life. Comp. *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 209, 210. [*Robinson*, l. c. ch. xxi. p. 164, ss.]

(5) The views of *Origen*, Comm. in Ep. ad Rom. v. Opp. iv. p. 565, in Lev. Hom. viii. Opp. i. p. 230, in Lucam, Opp. iii. p. 948, were connected with his notions concerning the sinful element in natural generation, (comp. § 63, note 4.) But it is worthy of notice, that in the first of the above passages he calls infant-baptism *a rite derived from the Apostles*: [Ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem accepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quod essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et spiritum ablui deberent.]

(6) See *Cypr.* Ep. 59, (written in the name of 66 Occidental bishops, Ep. 64, edit. Oxon.) Cyprian maintains that infants

should be baptized at the earliest convenience; it is, however, worthy of observation, that his argument in favour of infant-baptism is not founded upon the *guilt* of original sin, but upon the *innocent condition* of infants. Tertullian, on the other hand, urges this very reason in opposition to infant-baptism. But Cyprian looks more at the beneficial effects it is designed to produce, than at the responsibility which is attached to it. As we do not hesitate to salute the new born, yet innocent babe, with the holy kiss of peace, "*since he still exhibits the marks of the creative hands of God*," so we should not raise any objection to his being baptized. Comp. *Rettb.* p. 331. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. 2, p. 554. [transl. i. p. 363. *Robinson*, l. c. ch. xxii.]

(7) On this custom, comp. the works on ecclesiastical history and antiquities. [*Neander*. transl. i. p. 358, 359.] *Cyprian*, Ep. 76, (69. edit. Ox. p. 185,) where some very difficult questions are raised respecting sprinkling. [*Münscher*, l. c. i. p. 464.] Against the delay: Const. Apost. vi. 15, as it is done from disregard or levity. *Tertullian* allows even laymen, but not women, to administer the rite of baptism in cases of emergency; de Bapt. c. 17. Comp. Const. Apost. iii. c. 9–11.

(8) *Clement* of Alexandria recognizes only *that* baptism as valid, which is administered in the catholic church: *Τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ αἱρετικὸν οὐκ οἰκεῖον καὶ γνήσιον ὕδωρ*, Strom. i. 19, p. 375: likewise *Tert.* de bapt. c. 15: Unus omnino baptismus est nobis tam ex Domini evangelio, quam ex Apostoli litteris, quoniam unus Deus et unum baptisma et una ecclesia in cœlis......Hæretici autem nullum habent consortium nostræ disciplinæ, quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio communicationis. Non debeo in illis cognoscere, quod mihi est præceptum, quia non idem Deus est nobis et illis, nec unus Christus, i. e. idem: ideoque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem. Quem quum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent. Comp. de pud. 19. de præscr. 12. The synods of Iconium and Synnada (about the year 235) pronounced the baptism of heretics invalid, see the letter of *Firmilian*, bishop of Cæsarea, to Cyprian, (Ep. 75.) Eus. vii. 7. [*Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 473.] A synod held at Carthage (about the year 200) under Agrippinus had used similar language; see Cypr. Ep. 73, (ad Jubianum, p. 199, 130, Bal.) Cyprian adopted the custom of the Asiatic and African churches, and insisted that heretics should be re-baptized. But according

to him this was not a repetition of the act of baptism, but the *true* baptism; comp. Ep. 71, where he uses baptizari, but not re-baptizari in reference to heretics. Concerning the subsequent controversy with Stephen, comp. *Neander*, Kirchenges. i. p. 563, 77. [transl. i. p. 369–377.] *Rettberg*, p. 156, ss. The epistles 69–75 refer to this subject. *Stephen* recognized as valid baptism administered by heretics, but demanded the laying on of hands as significant of pœnitentia. The African bishops, on the other hand, restricted this latter rite to the case of the lapsi, and appealed to the custom observed by the heretics themselves in confirmation of their view. That the lapsi could not be re-baptized, needs no proof. The African usage was confirmed by the synods of Carthage, (held in the years 255 and 256.) Comp. Sententiæ Episcoporum lxxxii. de baptizandis hæreticis in Cypr. Opp. p. 229, (Fell.) [On the whole controversy comp. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 472—75.]

(9) Theod. Fab. hær. i. c. 10. On the question whether the sect of the Caiani (vipera venenatissima Tert.), to which Quintilla of Carthage, an opponent of baptism, belonged, was identical with the Gnostic Cainites; see *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 193. Some of the objections to baptism were the following: it is below the dignity of the Divine to be represented by anything earthly; Abraham was justified by faith alone; the apostles themselves were not baptized,[a] and Paul attaches little importance to the rite, (1 Cor. i. 17.)—That the majority of the Gnostics held baptism in high esteem, is evident from the circumstance, that they laid great stress on the baptism of Jesus, see *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 224. On the threefold baptism of the Marcionites, and further particulars, comp. the works treating of this subject: respecting the Clementine Homilies, see *Credner*, iii. p. 308.

(10) *Orig.* exh. ad Mart. i. p. 292, with reference to Mark x. 38; Luke xii. 50. *Tert.* de bapt. 16: Est quidem nobis etiam secundum lavacrum, unum et ipsum, *sanguinis* scilicet......Hos duos baptismos de vulnere perfossi lateris emisit: quatenus qui in sanguinem ejus crederent, aqua lavarentur; qui aqua lavis-

---

[a] To the remark of some: Tunc apostolos baptismi vicem implesse, quum in navicula fluctibus adspersi operti sunt, ipsum quoque Petrum per mare ingredientem satis mersum, *Tertullian* replies (de bapt. 12): aliud est adspergi vel intercipi violentia maris, aliud tingui disciplina religionis.

sent, etiam sanguinem potarent. Hic est baptismus, qui lavacrum et non acceptum repræsentat, et perditum reddit. Comp. Scorp. c. 6, *Cyprian* Ep. 73, and especially de exh. martyr. p. 168, 69. According to him the baptism of blood is in comparison with the baptism of water in gratia majus, in potestate sublimius, in honore pretiosius; it is baptisma, in quo angeli baptizant, b. in quo Deus et Christus ejus exultant, b. post quod nemo jam peccat, b. quod fidei nostræ incrementa consummat, b. quod nos de mundo recedentes statim Deo copulat. In aquæ baptismo accipitur peccatorum remissa, in sanguinis corona virtutum. Heretics are profited neither by the baptism of blood, nor by that of water, but the former is of some service to the catechumens who are not yet baptized. *Rettberg*, p. 382. Comp. also Acta Martyr. Perpet. et Fel. ed. Oxon. p. 29, 30, and *Dodwell*, de secundo Martyrii baptismo in his Diss. Cypr. xiii.[a]

§ 73.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Schulz, D., die christl. Lehre vom Abendmahl, nach dem Grundtexte des N. Test. Lpz. 1824, 31, (exegetico-dogmatic.) Works bearing upon the history of this doctrine: **Marheinecke, Phil.*, Ss. Patrum de præsentia Christi in cœna Domini sententia triplex s. sacræ Eucharistiæ historia tripartita. Heidelb. 1811, 4. *Meyer, Karl*, Versuch einer Geschichte der Transsubstantiationslehre mit Vorrede von Dr Paulus. Heidelb. 1832. †*Döllinger, J. J. J.* die Lehre von der Eucharistie in den 3 ersten Jahrhunderten. Mainz 1826. [*Knapp*, l. c. § 143–146.] *A. Ebrard*, des Dogma vom h. Abendmahl und seine Geschichte. Frankf. 1845.

The Christian church attached from the first great and mysterious importance to the bread and wine used in the Lord's Supper, as the symbols of the body and blood of Christ (Eucharist.)(1) It was not the tendency of the age to dissect the symbolical in a critico-philosophical manner, and to draw metaphysical distinctions between its constituent parts, viz. the outward sign on the one hand, and the thing represented by it on the other. On the contrary, the real and the symbolical were so blended, as not to destroy each other.(2) Thus it happens that in the writings of the Fathers of this period we meet with passages which speak distinctly of symbols, and at the same time with others which indicate belief in a *real participation* of the body and blood of Christ. Yet we may already discern some leading tendencies. *Ignatius*, as well as *Justin* and *Irenæus*,(3) laid great stress on the mysterious connection subsisting between the Logos and the elements. The idea of such a connection, however, was sometimes misunderstood, and gave rise to superstitious views, or it was wilfully perverted, in the hope of producing supernatural effects.(4) *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, though somewhat favourable to the supernatural, are nevertheless representatives of the symbolical aspect.(5) The Alexandrian school too espoused the latter, but the language of *Clement* on this subject is less definite than that of *Origen*.(6) Clement's notions are a mixture of symbolical interpretation and ideal mysticism. In the writings of Justin and Irenæus the idea occurs of a *sacrifice*, by which, however, they did not understand a daily repeated propitiatory sacrifice (in the sense of the Romish church), but a thank-offering presented by the Christians themselves.(7) This idea, which may have had its origin in the custom of offering oblations, was brought into connection with the service for the commemoration of the dead, and thus prepared imperceptibly the way for the later doctrine of masses for the deceased.(8) It led further to the notion of a sacrifice which is repeated by the priest, (but only symbolically); an idea which seems to have been first entertained by *Cyprian.*(9)—It is not quite certain, but probable, that the Ebionites celebrated the Lord's Supper as a commemorative feast; the mystical meals of some Gnostics, on the contrary, bear but little resemblance to the Lord's Supper.(10)

---

[a] Though the parallel drawn between the baptism of blood and that of water, is founded upon the whole symbolical tendency of the age, yet in its connection with the doctrine of the Fathers it appears to be more than a mere rhetorical figure. Like the comparison instituted between the death of the martyrs and that of Jesus, as well as the notions concerning penance, it rests upon the equilibrium which the writers of that period were desirous to maintain between the free will of man, and the effects of the Divine grace. In the baptism of water man appears more passive, in the baptism of blood he acts as a free agent.

(1) Respecting the terms εὐχαριστία, σύναξις, εὐλογία, see *Suicer* and the lexicons. [*Knapp*, l. c. p. 437.] With the exception of the *Hydroparastates* (Aquarii, Epiph. hær. 46. 2), all Christians, in accordance with its original institution, used wine and bread; the wine was generally mixed with water (κρᾶμα), and an allegorical signification was given to the mixture of these two elements, (*Justin M.* Apol. i. 65. *Iren.* v. 2, 3. *Cypr.* Epist. 63.) [*Knapp*, l. c. p. 441.] The *Artotyrites* are said to have used cheese along with bread. (Epiph. hær. 49, 2.) Comp. the acts of Perpetua and Felicitas in *Schwegler*, Montanismus, p. 122. *Olshausen*, monumenta, p. 101: Et clamavit me (Christus) et de caseo, quod mulgebat, dedit mihi quasi buccellam, et ego accepi junctis manibus et manducavi, et universi circumstantes dixerunt Amen. Et ad sonum vocis experrecta sum, commanducans adhuc dulcis nescio quid. Concerning the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the age of the Antonines, and the custom of administering it to the sick, &c. see Justin M. Apol. i. 65: [Προσφέρεται τῷ προεστῶτι τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἄρτος, καὶ ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος· καὶ οὗτος λαβὼν, αἶνον καὶ δόξαν τῷ Πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ Ἁγίου ἀναπέμπει, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιῶσθαι τούτων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ποιεῖται...εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος, και ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῖν διάκονοι διδόασιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παροῦσιν ἀποφέρουσι. 66. Καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν Εὐχαριστία......] [*Neander*, Hist. of the Ch. transl. i. 386.] On the liturgical part of this ordinance in general, see *Augusti*, vol. viii.

(2) "*It is only in consequence of the abstract and speculative tendency of the West and of modern times, that so many different significations have been assigned to what the early eastern church understood by the phrase* τοῦτο ἐστί. *If we would fully enter into its original meaning, we should not separate these significations at all. To say that the words in question denote transubstantiation, would be to take them in too definite and too comprehensive a sense; the interpretation according to which*

they would teach an existence cum et sub specie, is too artificial; the rendering: this signifies, says too little, and is without force. In the view of the writers of the gospels, (and after their example in that of the earliest Fathers) THE BREAD IN THE LORD'S SUPPER WAS THE BODY OF CHRIST. *But if they had been asked whether the bread was changed? they would have replied in the negative; if they had been told, that the communicants partook of the body with and under the form of the bread, they would not have understood it; if it had been asserted that the bread only signified the body, they would not have been satisfied."* *Strauss*, Leben Jesu, 1st edit. vol. ii. p. 437. Comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, ii. p. 1211, ss., and 1185, ss.

(3) *Ignat.* ad Smyrn. 7, reproaches the Docetæ: Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ πατὴρ ἤγειρεν, comp. ad. Trall. 8. ad Philad. 5. ad Rom. 5. Some understood the word εἶναι itself as symbolical. Comp. *Münscher* ed. by Cöln, i. p. 495, and on the other side, *Ebrard*, l. c. 254. *Justin*, Apol. i. 66, after having made a strict distinction between the bread and wine used in the Lord's Supper, and common bread and wine: Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι. He does not speak of a change of the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ, see *Ebrard*, p. 257. In the opinion of this writer, the phrase κατὰ μεταβολήν is the opposite of κατὰ κτίσιν, and denotes that natural food is accompanied by that provided by our Saviour for our new life, comp. also *Semisch*, ii. p. 439, ss. The passage is by no means clear. *Irenæus*, iv. 18, (33.) p. 250, (324, Grabe) also thinks that the common bread is changed into bread of a higher order, the earthly into the heavenly; but it does not therefore cease to be bread. He draws a parallel between this change and the transformation of the mortal body into the immortal, p. 251: Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τὴν ἔκκλησιν [ἐπίκλησιν] τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστὶν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου, οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μηκέτι εἶναι φθαρτὰ, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχοντα. Comp. v. 2, p. 292, 94, (396, 97,) and *Mas-*

sueti Diss. iii. art. 7, p. 114. Irenæus also defends the real presence of the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper in opposition to the Docetæ and Gnostics, iv. 18, § 4. 33, § 2, (*Münscher*, von Cölln, i. p. 496.) But the reason which he argues in favour of his views, viz. that *the Gnostics cannot partake of the bread and wine with thanksgiving because they despise matter*, shows that he regarded the elements as more than merely accidental things, though they are only bread and wine. Comp. *Thiersch* die Lehre des Irenæus von der Eucharistie, in Rudelbach and Guerikes Zeitschrift, 1841, p 40, ss.

(4) The fear of spilling any part of the wine (*Tert.* de corona mil. 3: Calicis aut panis nostri aliquid decuti in terram anxie patimur, and *Orig.* in Exod. Hom. xiii. 3), was perhaps founded on a right feeling of propriety, but it degenerated into superstitious dread. Thus the belief in an inherent vital power in the elements (φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτον τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν) was gradually converted into the belief of miraculous cures being effected by them, which would easily form the transition to gross superstition. The practice of administering the Lord's Supper to children may also be ascribed to the expectation of supernatural effects. Comp. the anecdotes of Cyprian, de lapsis, p. 132. *Rettberg*, p. 337.—The separation of the Lord's Supper from the agapæ, which had become necessary, the custom of preserving the bread, the communion of the sick, etc. furthered such views.

(5) It is remarkable that *Tertullian*, whose views, generally speaking, are realistic, shows in this instance a leaning towards the allegorical interpretation, according to which the Lord's Supper is *figura corporis Christi*, adv. Marc. i. 14. iv. 40. In the latter place he makes use of the *symbolical* to refute the notions of Marcion: if Christ had not possessed a real body, it could not have been represented: (vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non potest.—He might as well have said: it is impossible to partake of a phantom as such!)[a] This sentiment accords with what is said de anima, c. 17: vinum in sanguinis sui memoriam consecravit. Nevertheless, Tertullian speaks in other places, de resurr. c. 8. de pud. c. 9. of the partici-

---

[a] Respecting the manner in which Tertullian viewed the relation between the *sign* and the *thing signified*, comp. as a parallel-passage de resurr. carnis, c. 30.

pation of the Lord's Supper as an opimitate dominici corporis vesci, as a de Deo saginari; with these expressions comp. de Orat. 6: Corpus ejus in pane *censetur* (not *est.*) He also makes some mystical allusions (*e. g.* Gen. xlix. 11: Lavabit in vino stolam suam, is in his opinion a type, etc.) and adopts the notions of his age concerning the supernatural effects of the Lord's Supper. But the existence of such notions is no proof that the doctrine of transubstantiation, or another of similar import, was known at that time, since the same efficacy was ascribed to baptismal water. Comp. *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 517, and *Baur*, *F.*, Tertullian's Lehre vom Abendmahl, (Tübing. Zeitschr. 1839. part 2. p. 36. ss.) in opposition to *Rudelbach*, who asserts (as Luther had done before him) that Tertullian took the Lutheran view of the point in question. On the other hand, Œcolampadius and Zuinglius appealed to the same Father in support of *their* opinions. *Cyprian's* doctrine of the Lord's Supper is set forth in the 63d of his epistles, where he combats the error of those who used water instead of wine (see note 1.), and proves the obligation resting upon us of employing the latter. The phrase *ostenditur* used in refernece to the wine as the blood of Christ, is somewhat doubful. But the comparison which Cyprian draws between water and people, rather intimates that he was in favour of the symbolical interpretation, though he calls in other places (like Tertullian) the Lord's Supper simply the body and blood of Christ, Ep. 57, p. 117. What he says concerning the effects of the Lord's Supper, (the blessed drunkenness of the communicants compared with the drunkenness of Noah), and the miracles related by him, are a sufficient answer to the charge of insipidity. But in connection with the doctrine of the unity of the church, he attaches great practical importance to the idea of a *communio*, which was afterwards abandoned by the Romish church, but on which again much stress was laid by the reformers, Ep. 63, p. 154: Quo et ipso sacramento populus noster ostenditur adunatus, ut quemadmodum grana multa in unum collecta et commolita et commixta, panem unum faciunt, sic in Christo, qui est panis cœlestis, unum sciamus esse corpus, cui conjunctus sit noster numerus et adunatus. Comp. *Rettberg*, p. 332, ss.

(6) *Clement* adopts the mystical view of the Lord's Supper, according to which it is heavenly meat and heavenly drink; but he looks for the mystical not so much in the elements

(bread and wine), as in the spiritual union of the believer with Christ, and thinks that effects are produced only upon the mind, not upon the body. Clement also considers the Lord's Supper not only as σύμβολον, but as σύμβολον μυστικόν, Pæd. ii. 2. p. 184. (156. Sylb.) Comp. Pæd. 1. 6, p. 123: Ταύτας ἡμῖν οἰκείας τροφὰς ὁ Κύριος χορηγεῖ καὶ σάρκα ὀρέγει καὶ αἷμα ἐκχεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν εἰς αὔξησιν τοῖς παιδίοις ἐνδεῖ· ὢ τοῦ παραδόξου μυστηρίου κ. τ. λ. The use of the terms ἀλληγορεῖν, δημιουργεῖν, αἰνίττεσθαι clearly intimates that in his view the visible elements themselves are not that mystery, but the idea represented by them. His interpretation of the symbol is somewhat peculiar: the Holy Spirit is represented by the σάρξ, the Logos by the αἷμα, and the Lord himself, who unites in him the Logos and the Spirit, by the mixture of the wine and the water. A distinction between the blood once shed on the cross, and that represented in the Lord's Supper, is found in Pæd. ii. 2, p. 177. (151. Sylb.): Διττὸν δὲ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Κυρίου· τὸ μὲν γάρ ἐστιν αὐτοῦ σαρκικὸν, ᾧ τῆς φθορᾶς λελυτρώμεθα· τὸ δὲ πνευματικὸν, τουτέστιν ᾧ κεχρίσμεθα. Καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ πιεῖν τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, τῆς κυριακῆς μεταλαβεῖν ἀφθαρσίας· ἰσχὺς δὲ τοῦ λόγου τὸ πνεῦμα, ὡς αἷμα σαρκός. (Comp. *Bähr*, vom Tode Jesu, p. 80.) In the part which follows, the mixture of the wine and water is said to be a symbol of the union of the πνεῦμα with the spirit of man. Lastly, Clement also finds in the Old Test. types of the Lord's Supper, *e. g.* in Melchisedec, Strom. iv. 25, p. 637. (539. B. Sylb.) Among the Antenicene Fathers *Origen* is the only one who decidedly opposes those as ἀκεραιοτέρους, who take the external sign for the thing itself in the xi. Tom. on Matth. Opp. iii. p. 498-500. " As common meat does not defile, but rather unbelief and the impurity of the heart, so the meat which is consecrated by the Word of God and by prayer, does not by itself (τῷ ἰδίῳ λόγῳ) sanctify those who partake of it. The bread of the Lord profits only those who receive it with an undefiled heart and a pure conscience." In connection with such views Origen (as afterwards Zuinglius, and still less the Socinians) did not attach so much importance to the actual participation of the Lord's Supper as the other Fathers: Οὔτω δὲ οὔτε ἐκ τοῦ μὴ φαγεῖν παρ' αὐτὸ τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγιασθέντος λόγῳ θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξει ἄρτου, ὑστερούμεθα ἀγαθοῦ τινος· οὔτε ἐκ τοῦ φαγεῖν περισσεύομεν ἀγαθῷ τινι· τὸ γὰρ αἴτιον τῆς ὑστερήσεως ἡ κακία ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, καὶ τὸ αἴτιον τῆς περισσεύσεως ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἐστὶ καὶ τὰ καθορθώματα, ib. p. 898: Non enim panem illum visibilem, quem tenebat in manibus, corpus suum dicebat Deus Verbum, sed verbum, in cujus mysterio fuerat panis ille fragendus, etc. Comp. Hom. vii. 5. in Lev. Opp. ii. p. 225. Agnoscite, quia figuræ sunt, quæ in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt, et ideo tamquam spiritales et non tamquam carnales examinate et intelligite, quæ dicuntur. Si enim quasi carnales ista suscipitis, lædunt vos et non alunt. Est enim et in evangeliis littera.........quæ occidit eum, qui non spiritaliter, quæ dicuntur, adverterit. Si enim secundum litteram sequaris hoc ipsum, quod dictum est: nisi manducaveritis carnem meam et biberitis sanguinem meum, occidit hæc littera.

(7) Concerning the oblations, see the works on ecclesiastical history, and on antiquities. The apostolical Fathers speak of sacrifices, by which, however, we are to understand either the sacrifices of the heart and conduct, (*Barn.* c. 2.), or the sacrifices of prayer and alms, (*Clem. of Rome*, c. 40-44.), which may also include the gifts, (δῶρα) offered at the Lord's Supper; comp. also *Ignat.* ad Ephes. 5; ad Trall. 7: ad Magn. 7. Only in the passage ad Philad. 4, the εὐχαριστία is mentioned in connection with the θυσιαστήριον, but in such a manner that no argument for the later theory of sacrifice can be inferred from it; see *Höflinger*, die Lehre der apostolischen Väter vom Opfer im Christlichen cultus, 1841. More definite is the language of *Justin M.* Dial. c. Tryph. c. 117, who calls the Lord's Supper θυσία and προσφορά, and compares it with the sacrifices under the Old Test. dispensation.[a] He connects with this the offering of prayers (εὐχαριστία), which are also sacrifices. But the Christians themselves make the sacrifice; there is not the slightest allusion to a repeated sacrifice on the part of Christ! Comp. *Ebrard*, l. c. p. 236, ss. *Irenæus*, adv. hær. iv. 17. 5, p. 249, (324 Gr.), teaches with equal clearness, that Christ had commanded, not on account of *God*, but because of the *disciples*, to offer the first fruits, and thus breaking the bread and blessing the cup with thanksgiving he instituted: oblationem, quam ecclesia Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat; primitias suorum munerum, etc. The principal thing is the disposition of the per-

---

[a] Namely, "*as a thankoffering for the gifts of nature, which was followed by thanksgiving for all other Divine blessings.—The primitive church had a distinct conception of this connection between the Lord's Supper, and what might be called the natural aspect of the passover.*" *Baur*, l. c. p. 137.

son who offers. On the difficult passage, iv. 18, p. 251, (326. Gr.): Judæi autem jam non offerunt, manus enim eorum sanguine plenæ sunt: non enim receperunt verbum, quod [per quod?] offertur Deo. Comp. *Massuet.* diss. iii. in Iren. *Deylingii* Obss. sacr. P. iv. p. 92, ss., and *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. 2, p. 588, [transl. i. p. 385.] For the views of *Origen* concerning the sacrifice, comp. *Höfling.* Origenis doctrina de sacrificiis Christianorum in examen vocatur, Part. 1. and 2. (Erl. 1840-41). especially Part. 2, p. 24, ss.

(8) *Tert.* de cor. mil. 3: Oblationes pro defunctis pro natalitiis annua die facimus. De exh. cast. 11: Pro uxore defuncta oblationes annuas reddis, etc., where he also uses the term sacrificium. De monog. 10, he even speaks of a refrigerium which hence accrues to the dead, comp. de Orat. 14, (19.) It might here also be mentioned, that Tertullian, as the Christians in general, called prayers sacrifices; on the other hand, it should not be overlooked, that in the above passage de monogamia, prayers and sacrifices are distinctly separated. *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 155.

(9) *Cyprian,* in accordance with his whole hierarchical tendency, first of all the Fathers, maintained, that the sacrifice does not consist in the thankoffering of the congregation, but in the sacrifice made by the *priest*, in the stead of Christ: vice Christi fungitur, id quod Christus fecit, imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia Deo Patri. But even Cyprian does not go beyond the idea of the sacrifice being *imitated*, which is very different from that of its actual *repetition.* Comp. *Rettberg,* p. 334, and *Neander*, l. c. i. 2. p. 588 [transl. i. p. 385. On the other side, see *Marheinecke.* Symbolik, iii. 420.]

(10) Concerning the Ebionites see *Credner*, l. c. iii. p. 308, on the Ophites, Epiph. hær. 37, 5. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 196.

If we compare the preceding observations with the doctrines afterwards set forth in the confessions of faith, we arrive at the following conclusions: 1. The Roman Catholic notion of transubstantiation is as yet altogether unknown; nevertheless, the first traces of it, as well as of the theory of a sacrifice, may be found in the writings of some of the Fathers of this period. 2. The views of (Ignatius), Justin and Irenæus can be compared to those of Luther only in so far as they are alike remote from transubstantiation properly speaking, and from symbolical interpretation, and connect the real with the ideal. 3. The theologians of North Africa and Alexandria are the representatives of the reformed church. The positive tendency of the Calvinistic doctrine may be best seen in Clement, the negative view of Zuinglius is represented by Origen; and both the positive and the negative aspects of the reformed doctrine, are united in Tertullian and Cyprian. The Ebionites (if anything more were known respecting their sentiments) might probably be considered as the forerunners of the Socinians, the Gnostics as those of the Quakers.

§ 74.

DEFINITION OF THE TERM SACRAMENT.

[*Halley*, *R.*, Lectures on the Sacraments, P. I. Lect. i. p. 1—14.]

The two ordinances of baptism and the Lord's Supper existed before such a systematic definition of the term Sacrament had been formed, as to include both.(1) The phrases μυστήριον and *sacramentum* are indeed used in reference to either,(2) but they are quite as frequently applied to other religious symbols and usages founded upon some higher religious notion, and, lastly, to certain more profound doctrines of the church.(3)

(1) The word *Sacrament* is not used in the New Test. in the sense in which we understand it, inasmuch as baptism and the Lord's Supper are nowhere described as two associated rites which distinctly differ from other symbolical usages. But shortly afterwards greater importance was attached to the former than to the latter, notwithstanding the prevailing symbolizing tendency of the church. It therefore became necessary that the church itself should determine the idea of a sacrament, as nothing could be decided from Scripture.

(2) As *Tertullian*, generally speaking, is the author of the later dogmatic terminology (comp. the phrases: novum Testamentum, trinitas, peccatum originale, satisfactio) so *he* is the first writer who uses the phrase sacramentum baptismatis et eucharistiæ, adv. Marc. iv. 30. Comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, ii. p. 1188, and the works quoted by him. The corresponding Greek term μυστήριον occurs in *Justin*, Apol. i. 66, and *Clem.* Pæd. i. p. 123, (comp. *Suicer*, sub voce.)

(3) *Tertullian* also uses the word sacramentum in a more general sense, adv. Marc. v. 18, and adv. Prax. 30, where he calls

the Christian religion a sacrament. Comp. the Index latinitatis Tertullianeæ, by Semler, p. 500. [*Halley*, l. c. p. 9, 10.] The same may be said respecting the use of the term μυστήριον. *Cyprian* employs the word sacramentum with the same latitude as Tertullian. He speaks indeed, Ep. 63, of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but also of a sacrament of the Trinity (de orat. dom. where the Lord's prayer itself is called a sacrament.) On the twofold sense of the Latin word, sometimes denoting oath, sometimes used as the translation of the Greek term μυστήριον, see *Rettberg*, p. 324, 25.

SIXTH SECTION.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LAST THINGS.

(ESCHATOLOGY.)

§ 75.

THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST—MILLENNARIANISM. (CHILIASM.)

(*Corrodi*) kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus. Zür. 1781—83. iii. 1794. *Münscher, W.*, Entwickelung der Lehre vom tausendjährigen Reiche in den 3 ersten Jahrhunderten, in Henkes Magazin. vol. vi. p. 233, ss. [Comp. the article on Millennium in *Kitto's* Cyclop. of Bibl. Liter., where the literature will be found.]

The disciples of Christ having received from their master the promise of his second coming (παρουσία), the primitive church looked upon this event as one which would shortly come to pass, and brought it into connection with the general resurrection of the dead and the final judgment.(1) Of all the parts of the New Test., none gave rise to so many conjectures on this subject, as the book of Revelation, which some ascribed to the Apostle John, while others rejected this opinion, or even contested its canonical authority.(2) The idea having been introduced in the 20th ch. of that book, of a millennial kingdom, together with the notion of a second resurrection,(3) the more carnally-minded freely indulged in further developements of their millennial hopes. This was the case not only with the Judaizing Ebionites(4) and *Cerinthus*,(5) (according to the testimony of some writers), but also with some orthodox Fathers, such as *Papias* of Hierapolis, *Justin*, *Irenæus*,(6) and *Tertullian*.

The millennial notions of the latter were in full accordance with his Montanist views.(7) *Cyprian* adopted partly the same ideas, but only in a greatly modified form.(8) The Gnostics were from the first unfavourable to millennarian tendencies,(9) which were also opposed by some orthodox writers, *e.g.* the presbyter *Caius* in Rome, and the theologians of the Alexandrian school, especially *Origen.*(10)

---

(1) Comp. the works on biblical theology. The notion of the second coming of Christ in distinction from the first was founded on the New Test. *Justin M.* Apol. i. 52: *Δύο γὰρ αὐτοῦ παρουσίας προεκήρυξαι οἱ προφῆται· μίαν μὲν τὴν ἤδη γενομένην, ὡς ἀτίμου καὶ παθητοῦ ἀνθρώπου· τὴν δὲ δευτέραν, ὅταν μετὰ δόξης ἐξ οὐρανῶν μετὰ τῆς ἀγγελικῆς αὐτοῦ στρατιᾶς παραγενήσεσθαι κεκήρυκται, ὅτε καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀνεγερεῖ πάντων τῶν γενομένων ἀνθρώπων κ. τ. λ.* Cf. dial. c. Tr. 45. Iren. i. 10, (he makes a distinction between *ἔλευσις* and *παρουσία*) iv. 22. 2.

(2) See above § 31, note 7, esp. Euseb. vii. 25, and the introductions to the commentaries on the book of Revelation [*Stuart*, i. p. 283, ss.]

(3) Comp. the commentaries on this chapter, [*Stuart*, ii. p. 459, ss., 474.] Justin M. calls the *first* resurrection the *holy* one, dial. c. Tryph. § 113. Comp. *Semisch*, ii. p. 471.

(4) Jerome in his comment. on Is. lxvi. 20, observes that the Ebionites understand the passage, " And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations upon horses, and in chariots, and in litters, and upon mules, and upon swift beasts," in its literal sense, and apply it to chariots drawn by four horses and conveyances of every description. They believe, that at the last day, when Christ will reign at Jerusalem, and the temple be rebuilt, the Israelites will be gathered together from all the ends of the earth. They will have no wings to fly, but they will come in waggons of Gaul, in covered chariots of war, and on horses of Spain and Cappadocia; their wives will be carried in litters, and ride upon mules of Numidia instead of horses. Those who hold offices, dignitaries, and princes, will come in coaches from Britain, Spain, Gaul, and the regions where the river Rhine is divided in two arms; the subdued nations will hasten to meet them. But the author of the Clementine Homilies, far from adopting such gross notions,

(*Credner*, l. c. iii. p. 289, 90,) even opposes them, *Schliemann*, p. 251 and 519.

⁽⁵⁾ Euseb. iii. 28, (from tbe accounts given by Caius of Rome and Dionysius of Alexandria.) According to Caius *Cerinthus* taught: Μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπίγειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα· πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν, this state would last a thousand years: according to Dionsyius, ἐπίγειον ἔσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ Βασιλείαν. Καὶ ὧν αὐτὸς ὠρέγετο φιλοσώματος ὢν καὶ πάνυ σαρκικὸς, ἐν τούτοις ὀνειροπολεῖν ἔσεσθαι, γαστρὸς καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γαστέρα πλησμονῶν, τουτέστι σιτίοις καὶ πότοις καὶ γάμοις καὶ δι᾽ ὧν εὐφημότερον ταῦτα ᾠήθη ποριεῖσθαι, ἑορταῖς καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἱερείων σφαγαῖς. Comp. vii. 25, and Theodoret fab. hær. ii. 3, and the works referred to in § 23. [*Burton*, Bampton Lecture, vi. lect. p. 177–179, and note 76.]

⁽⁶⁾ "*In all these works the belief in the millennium is so evident, that no one can hesitate to consider it as universal in an age, when certainly such motives as it offered, were not unnecessary to animate men to suffer for Christianity.*" Gieseler, Lehrb. der Kirchengeschichte, i. § 50. [Translation of Cunningham, i. p. 100. Comp. however, the writings of Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp, Tatian, Athenagoras, and Theophilus of Antioch, in none of which millennarian notions are propounded. On the millennial views of *Papias* see Euseb. iii. 39: Χιλιάδα τινά φησιν ἐτῶν ἔσεσθαι μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν, σωματικῶς τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλείας ἐπὶ ταυτησὶ τῆς γῆς ὑποστησομένης. Comp. *Barn.* c. 15. (Ps. xc. 4.) *Hermas*, lib. i. Vis. i. 3, and the observations of *Jachmann*, p. 86.—*Justin*, Dial. c. Tr. 80, 81, asserts, that according to his own opinion and that of the other orthodox theologians (εἴ τινές εἰσιν ὀρθογνώμονες κατὰ πάντα χριστιανοί), the elect will rise from the dead, and spend a thousand years in the city of Jerusalem, which will be restored, changed, and beautified, (in support of his views he appeals to Jeremiah and Ezekiel); at the same time he admits that even orthodox Christians (τῆς καθαρᾶς καὶ εὐσεβοῦς γνώμης[a]) entertain different views, comp. Apol. i. 11; he there opposes the idea of a human political kingdom, but not that of a millennial reign of Christ. Justin holds an intermediate position between gross sensualism (συμπιεῖν πάλιν καὶ συμφαγεῖν, dial. c. Tr. § 51,) on the one hand, and spiritual idealism on the other. [Comp. *Semisch, C.*, Justin Martyr, his life, writings, and opinions, transl. by J. E. Ryland, ii. 370–376.] *Irenæus*, adv. hær. v. 33, p. 332. (453. Gr.) defends Chiliasm, especially in opposition to the Gnostics. He appeals *e. g.* to Matth. xxvi. 29, and Is. xi. 6.—On the most sensuous and fantastical description of the fertility of the vine and of corn, which is said to have originated with Papias and the disciples of John, see *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln i. p. 44. *Grabe*, Spic. Sec. 2, p. 31, and 230. *Corrodi*, ii. p. 496. [Iren. adv. hær. v. 33: "The days will come in which vines will grow, each having ten thousand branches; and on each branch there will be ten thousand twigs, and on each twig ten thousand clusters of grapes, and in each cluster ten thousand grapes; and each grape, when expressed, will yield twenty-five μετρῆται of wine. And when any one of the saints shall take hold of a cluster of grapes, another (cluster) will cry out: I am a better cluster, take me, and on my account give thanks to the Lord. In like manner, a grain of wheat will produce ten thousand heads, and each head will have ten thousand grains; and each grain will yield ten pounds of clear fine flour; and other fruits will yield seeds and herbage in the same proportion." Respecting the millennarian notions propounded in the Sibylline oracles, the book of Enoch, the Testatament of the twelve Patriarchs, etc, see *Stuart*, comment. on the Apocalypse, i. p. 50, ss., 87, ss., 107, ss. Comp. also ii. p. 488, ss.]

---

[a] Various writers have endeavoured to remove the contradiction between these two sentiments, *Rössler*, i. p. 104, interpolates: many *otherwise* orthodox Christians. *Münscher* (Handbuch ii. p. 420,) and others, interpolate the word μὴ [comp. *Gieseler*, l. c. i. § 52, note 19.]

(7) *Tertullian's* views are intimately connected with his Montanist notions. His treatise: De spe fidelium (Hier. de vir. illuss. c. 18, and in Ezech. c. 36,) is indeed lost; but comp. adv. Marc. iii. 24. Tertullian, however, speaks not so much of sensual enjoyments, as of a copia omnium bonorum spiritualium, and even opposes the too sensuous interpretations of Messianic passages, de resurr. carn. c. 26, though his own exposition is not free from similar errors, comp. *Neander*, Antignosticus, p. 499. Kirchengeschichte, i. 3, p. 1092, [transl. ii. p. 325.] On the question, how far we may implicitly rely on the assertion of Euseb. v. 16, that Montanus had fixed upon the city Pepuza in Phrygia as the seat of the millennial reign? and on the millennarian notions of the Montanists in general, see *Gieseler*, l. c. i. § 48.

(8) Respecting his doctrine of Antichrist, and his belief that the end of the world would soon come, comp. Ep. 58. p. 120,

124, Ep. 61. p. 144, exh. mart. ab init. p. 167. Tert. adv. Jud. iii. § 118, p. 91, see *Rettberg*, p. 340, ss.

(9) This is evident both from the real nature of Gnosticism itself, and the opposition which *Irenæus* raised to it. Some have even ascribed the origin of Marcion's system to a millennarian controversy; comp. however *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 295.

(10) Concerning *Caius* and his controversy with the Montanist *Proclus*, see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. p. 1093, [transl. ii. p. 325.] *Origen* speaks in very strong terms against the millennarians, whose opinions he designates: ineptas fabulas, figmenta inania, δόγματα ἀτοπώτατα, μοχθηρά, etc. de princ. ii. c. 11, § 2. Opp. i. p. 104, contra Cels. iv. 22. Opp. i. p. 517. Select. in Ps. Opp. Tom. ii. p. 570, in Cant. Cant. Opp. T. iii. p. 28. (*Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 44–46. Respecting *Hippolytus*, who wrote a treatise on Antichrist without being a true Millennarian, comp. Photius Cod. 202. *Hænell*, de Hippolyto (Gött. 838. 4.) p. 37, 60. *Corrodi*, ii. p. 401, 406, 413, 416.

§ 76.

THE RESURRECTION.

Teller, G. A., fides dogmatis de resurrectione carnis per 4 priora secula. Hal. et Helmst. 1766, 8. *Flügge, Ch. W.*, Geschichte der Lehre vom Zustande des Menschen nach dem Tode. Lpzg. 1799, 1800, 8. †*Hubert Beckers*, Mittheilungen aus den merkwürdigsten Schriften der verflossenen Jahrhunderte über den Zustand der Seele nach dem Tode. Augsb. 1835, 36.

Though traces of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, which is so ably set forth by the Apostle Paul, may be found in certain notions of earlier antiquity,(1) yet it received its full confirmation, and was brought within the apprehension of even the uneducated only by the resurrection of Christ.(2) During the period of Apologetics it was further developed, so as to involve the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh.(3) The objections of the opponents of this doctrine, which may be chiefly traced to that tendency of the human mind which prevents man from looking beyond what is visible and tangible, were more or less fully answered in the epistle of *Clement of Rome,* as well as in the writings of *Justin, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Irenæus, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Cyprian,* and others.(4) Most of the Fathers believed in the resuscitation of the very same body which man possessed while on earth.(5) The theologians of the Alexandrian school, however, formed an exception; *Origen,* in particular,(6) endeavoured to clear the doctrine in question from its false additions, by reducing it to the simple idea of Paul, and sought at the same time to refine and to spiritualize it after the manner of the Alexandrian school. The Gnostics, on the other hand, rejected the doctrine of the resurrection of the body entirely;(7) the false teachers of Arabia, whom Origen combated, asserted that both soul and body fall into a sleep of death, from which they will not awake till the last day.(8)

---

(1) Comp. *Herder,* von der Auferstehung (Werke Zur Religion und Theologie, vol. xi.)—*Müller, G.,* über die Auferstehungslehre der Parsen, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1835, 2nd. part, p. 477, ss. *Corrodi,* l. c. p. 345.

(2) It must excite surprise that, while Paul represents *the resurrection of Christ* as the central point of the whole doctrine, the Fathers of the present period keep this fact so much in the back-ground, or that at least it does not always form the foundation of their opinions concerning the resurrection of the body. Some, *e. g. Athenagoras,* who nevertheless composed a separate treatise on the subject in question, and *Minucius Felix* are entirely silent on the resurrection of Christ (see below); the others also rest their arguments chiefly upon reason and analogies from nature, (the change of day and night, seed and fruit, the Phœnix, etc., Clement of Rome, c. 24, and Ep. 11. 9.)

(3) It is well known that the New Test. does not teach an ἀνάστάσις τῆς σαρκός, but τῶν νεκρῶν, and speaks of a revivification of the σῶμα. But the phrase resurrectio carnis came soon into use, and found also its way into what is called the Apostles' Creed.

(4) *Clement,* Ep. i. ad Cor. c. 24-26, comp. note 2.) *Justin M.* adopts the literal interpretation of the doctrine of the resurrec-

tion of the body, and thinks that it will rise again with all its members, Fragm. de resurr. c. 3, (edited as a separate programme by *Teller*, 1766.) Comp. *Semisch*, ii. p. 146, ss. Even cripples will rise with the body which they possessed while on earth; it is of course to be supposed that Christ will heal them after the resurrection at his second *πάρουσία*, Dial. c. Tryph. c. 69. Justin founds his belief in the resurrection of the body chiefly upon the omnipotence, justice, and benevolence of God, as well as the resurrection of Christ, and shows in connection with it, that the body must necessarily participate in future rewards or punishments, for body and soul necessarily constitute one whole. Christianity differs from the systems of either Pythagoras or Plato, in that it teaches not only the immortality of the soul, but also the resurrection of the body. But as Justin investigated this subject more thoroughly, he was necessarily led to the discussion of certain questions which generally engaged the attention of scholastic divines alone, that *e. g.* relating to the sexual relations of the resurrection-bodies, which he compared to mules (?) [Quæst. et Resp. p. 423: Tametsi membra genitalia post resurrectionem, ad prolificationem utilia non erunt: ad reminiscentiam tamen ejus facient, quod per ea membra mortales acceperint generationem, auctum, et diuturnitatem. Inducimur namque per ea ad cogitationem tam prolixæ sapientiæ *Christi*, quæ illa (hominibus per mortem intercedentibus attribuit, ad eorum per generationem) augendorum conservationem, ut sobolis creatæ successione, genus nostrum in immortalitate (perducaret.)] The arguments which *Athenagoras* adduces in his treatise de resurr. (espec. c. 11.) are partly the same which were in after ages urged by natural theology in support of the doctrine of immortality: the moral nature of man, his liberty, and the retributive justice of God. Concerning the resurrection of the body, he has regard to the objections which have been made to it at all times, on the ground, that it cannot be reconciled with the natural course of things, (the fact that the elements of one organism may enter into the composition of another, etc.) He is, however, fully satisfied in his own mind, that at the resurrection all things will be restored, *πρὸς τὴν τοῦ αὐτοῦ σώματος ἁρμονίαν καὶ σύστασιν.*—*Theophilus*, ad Aut. i. 8, uses similar language.—*Irenæus*, adv. Hær. v. 12, and 13, also asserts the identity of the future with the present body, and appeals to the analogous revivification (not new creation) of separate organs of the body in some of the miraculous cures performed by Christ, (*e.g.* of the blind man, the man with the withered hand). He alludes particularly to those whom Christ raised from the dead, the son of the widow at Nain, and Lazarus (but makes no mention of the body of Christ himself!)[a] That *Tertullian*, who wrote a separate work on the present subject (de resurrectione carnis), believed in the resurrection of the body, is what we might expect, especially as he made no strict distinction between the body and the soul. On the contrary, he points out the intimate connection existing between the one and the other during the present life: Nemo tam proximus tibi (animæ) quem post Dominum diligas, nemo magis frater tuus, quæ (sc. caro) tecum etiam in Deo nascitur (c. 63.) In his opinion the flesh participates in spiritual blessings, in the means of grace presented to us in unction, baptism and the Lord's Supper; it even participates in martyrdom (the baptism of blood)! The body too is created after the image of God! (comp. above § 56, note 3.) He uses the same illustrations of day and night, the Phœnix, etc., which we find in the writings of others, and maintains the identity of the future with the present body, c. 52; Certe non aliud resurgit quam quod seminatur, nec aliud seminatur, quam quod dissolvitur humi, nec aliud dissolvitur humi, quam caro, cf. 6, 63. He endeavours to meet the objection, that certain members will be of no use in the future life, by saying that the members of the human body are not only designed for the mean service of the visible world, but also for something higher. Even on earth the mouth serves not only for the purpose of eating, but also to speak and to praise God, etc., c. 60, and 61. *Minucius Felix* makes Cæcilius bring forward the objections of the heathen to the possibility, both of the immortality of the soul, and of the resurrection of the body, c. 11: Vellem tamen sciscitari, utrumne sine corpore, an cum corporibus? et corporibus quibus, ipsisne an innovatis resurgatur? Sine corpore? hoc, quod sciam, neque mens, neque anima, nec vita est; ipso corpore? sed jam ante dilapsum est; alio corpore? ergo homo novus nascitur, non prior ille reparatur. Et tamen tanta ætas abiit, sæcula innumera fluxerunt; quis unus ab inferis vel Protesilai sorte remeavit, horarum saltem permisso commeatu, vel ut exemplo crederemus?—The arguments which he adduces, c. 34, in reply to these objections, are founded upon the omnipotence of God, which created man out of nothing, which is certainly more difficult, than the mere restoration of his body; upon the above analogies (expectandum nobis etiam corporis ver est), and the necessity of a retribution which the deniers of the resurrection are anxious to escape.—The notions of *Cyprian* on this subject are formed after those of Tertullian, comp. de habitu virg. p. 100, and *Rettberg*, p. 345.

---

[a] Irenæus takes the word "flesh" in 1 Cor. xv. 50, which was often quoted against the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, to mean *carnal sense.*

(5) See the passages quoted in the preceding note.

(6) *Clement of Alexandria* had already intended to write a separate work περὶ ἀναστάσεως, com. Pæd. i. 6, p. 125, (104 Sylb.); according to Euseb. vi. 24, and Hieron. apud Rufinum, *Origen* composed not only two books, but also (according to the latter) two dialogues on the present subject, comp. contra Cels. v. 20. Opp. i. p. 592, de princ. ii. 10, i. p. 100, and the fragments Opp. T. i. p. 33—37. Clement of Alexandria only touches upon the doctrine of the resurrection in such of his writings, as are yet extant, without discussing it. The passage Strom. iv. 5, p. 569, (479, S.), where he represents the future deliverance of the soul from the fetters of the body as the object of the most ardent desire of the wise man, does not give a very favourable idea of his orthodoxy in this point. But his disciple *Origen* maintains Comm. in Matth. Opp. iii. p. 811, 12, that we may put our trust in Christ without believing the resurrection of the body, provided we hold fast the immortality of the soul. Nevertheless he defended the doctrine of the church in opposition to Celsus, but endeavoured to divest it from every thing which might give a handle to scoffers: on this account he rejected the doctrine of the identity of the bodies (which is not that of Paul.) Contra Cels. iv. 57. Opp. i. p. 548. v. 18. ibid. p. 590: Οὔτε μὲν οὖν ἡμεῖς, οὔτε τὰ θεῖα γράματα αὐταῖς φησι σαρξὶ μηδεμίαν μεταβολὴν ἀνειληφυίαις τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον, ζήσεσθαι τοὺς πάλαι ἀποθανόντας, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀναδύντας. Ὁ δὲ Κέλσος συκοφαντεῖ ἡμᾶς ταῦτα λέγων. Cap. 23, p. 594: Ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν οὔ φαμεν τὸ διαφθαρὲν σῶμα ἐπανέρχεσθαι εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς φύσιν, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν διαφθαρέντα κόκκον τοῦ σίτου ἐπανέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόκκον τοῦ σίτου. Λέγομεν γὰρ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ κόκκου τοῦ σίτου ἐγείρεται στάχυς, οὕτω λόγος τις ἔγκειται τῷ σώματι, ἀφ' οὗ μὴ φθειρομένου ἐγείρεται τὸ σῶμα ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ. The appeal to the omnipotence of God appeared to him an ἀτοπωτάτη ἀναχώρησις, p. 595, according to the axiom εἰ γὰρ αἰσχρόν τι δρᾷ ὁ Θεός,

οὐκ ἐστι θεὸς; but the biblical doctrine of the resurrection, if rightly interpreted, includes nothing that is unworthy of God, comp. viii. 49. 50. Opp. i. p. 777. 78. Selecta in Psalm Opp. ii. p. 532—36, where he designates the literal interpretation as φλυαρίαν πτωχῶν νοημάτων, and proves, that every body must be adapted to the surrounding world. If we would live in water, we ought to possess the nature of fish, etc. The heavenly state also demands glorified bodies, like those of Moses and Elias. In the same place Origen gives a more correct interpretation of Matth. viii. 12; Ps. iii. 7. and other passages, which were commonly applied to the resurrection of the body. Comp. de princ. ii. 10. Opp. i. p. 100. (Red. p. 223.), *Schnitzer*, p. 147, ss. On the other side: Hieron. ad Pammach. ep. 38. 61.) Photius (according to Method.) Cod. 234.

(7) Thus the Gnostic *Apelles* maintained that the work of Christ had reference only to the soul, and rejected the resurrection of the body. *Baur*, Gnosis, p. 410. [That the Gnostics believed in the immortality of the soul, appears indisputably certain, but their notions concerning matter made them shrink with horror from the idea of a reunion of the body with the soul, and led them to reject the doctrine of the resurrection of the former. But they have unjustly been charged by the Fathers with a denial of the resurrection in general. Comp. *Burton*, Bampton Lecture, notes 58 and 59, and *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 51–52.]

(8) Respecting the error of the *Thnetopsychites* (as John Damascenus calls them) about the year 248. comp. Euseb. vi. 37: Τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν ψυχὴν τέως μὲν κατὰ τὸν ἐνεστῶτα καιρὸν ἅμα τῇ τελευτῇ συναποθνήσκειν τοῖς σώμασι καὶ συνδιαφθείρεσθαι, αὖθις δέ ποτε κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀναστάσεως καιρὸν σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀναβιώσεσθαι.

§ 77.

GENERAL JUDGMENT.—HADES.—PURGATORY.—CONFLAGRATION OF THE WORLD.

Baumgarten, J. S., historia doctrinæ de statu animarum separatarum, Hal. 1754. 4. *Ernesti J. A.*, de veterum Patr. opinione de statu medio animarum a copore sejunct. Excurs. in lectt. academ. in Ep. ad Hebr. Lips. 1795. [*Jac. Windet*, Στρωματεὺς ἐπιστολικός de Vita Functorum Statu ex Hebræorum et Græcorum comparatis Sententiis concinnatus; Lond. 1663-64. *Thom. Burnet*, De Statu Mortuorum et Resurgentium, Lond. 1757. Comp. *Knapp*, l. c. p. 463, 464, and p. 478.]

The transactions of the general judgment, which was thought to be connected with the general resurrection, were depicted in various ways. Some ascribed the office of judge to the Son, others to the Father, both in opposition to the Hellenistic myth of the judges in the under-world.(1) The idea of a *Hades* (שְׁאוֹל), which was known both to the Hebrews and the Greeks, was transferred to Christianity, and the assumption that the true happiness, or the final misery of the departed does not commence till after the general judgment and the resurrection of the body, appeared to render necessary the belief in an intermediate state. The soul was supposed to remain there from the moment of its separation from the body to the said catastrophe.(2) *Tertullian*, however, held that the martyrs went at once to the abode of the blessed, paradise, and thought that in this particular point they enjoyed an advantage over other Christians.(3) *Cyprian* does not seem to acknowledge any intermediate state whatever.(4) The Gnostics rejected the notion concerning the Hades together with that concerning the resurrection of the body, and imagined that those who are spiritually minded (the pneumatic,) would immediately after death be delivered from the bondage of the demiurgus, and be elevated to the πλήρωμα.(5) The oriental idea of a purifying fire also occurs during this period in the writings of *Clement of Alexandria* and *Origen*. This purifying fire, however, is not thought to perform its work in the intermediate state, but is either taken in a comprehensive sense, or supposed to stand in some connection or other with the general conflagration of the world.(6)

---

(1) *Just. M.* Apol. i. 8: Πλάτων δὲ ὁμοίως ἔφη Ῥαδάμανθον καὶ Μίνω κολάσειν τοὺς ἀδίκους παρ' αὐτοὺς ἐλθόντας, ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πρᾶγμα φαμὲν γενήσεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. For the views of Justin concerning the general judgment see Apol. ii. 9; *Semisch*, ii. p. 474. 75. *Tatian* contra Gr. 6: Δικάζουσι δὲ ἡμῖν οὐ Μίνως, οὐδὲ Ῥαδάμανθυς..... δοκιμαστὴς δὲ αὐτός ὁ ποιητὴς Θεὸς γίνεται. Comp. c. 25.

(2) *Justin M.* dial. c. Tr. § 5. makes the souls of the pious take up their temporary abode in a better, those of the wicked in a worse place. He even terms that doctrine heretical, (§ 80.) according to which the souls are received into heaven immediately after death; but he admits that they possess a presentiment of their future destiny, Coh. ad Græc. c. 35. *Iren.* v. 31, p. 331. (451. Gr.): Αἱ ψυχαὶ ἀπέρχονται εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ὡρισμένον αὐταῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, κἀκεῖ μέχρι τῆς ἀναστάσεως φοιτῶσι, περιμένουσαι τὴν ἀνάστασιν· ἔπειτα ἀπολαβοῦσαι τὰ σώματα καὶ ὁλοκλήρως ἀναστᾶσαι, τουτέστι σωματικῶς, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀνέστη, οὕτως ἐλεύσονται εἰς τὴν ὄψιν τοῦ Θεοῦ. (in connection with it the descensus Christi ad inferos, and Luke xvi. 22, etc.) *Tertullian* mentions de anima 55. a treatise in which he says he has proved omnem animam apud inferos sequestrari in diem Domini. The treatise itself is no longer extant, but comp. de anima, c. 58. Tertullian l. c. rejects the notion of *the sleep of the soul,* which is not to be confounded with the error of the Arabian false teachers (§ 76;) he also opposes the opinion founded upon 1 Sam. xxviii., that spirits might be conjured up from the abode of the dead, by appealing to Luke xvi. 26. (comp. Orig. Hom. ii. in 1 Reg. Opp. ii. p. 490–98.)

(3) *Tert.* de anim. 55. de resurr. 43: Nemo peregrinatus a corpore statim immoratur penes Dominum, nisi ex martyrii prærogativa, paradiso scilicet, non inferis deversurus.—On the meaning of the different terms: inferi, sinus Abrahæ, Paradisus, see adv. Marc. iv. 34. Apol. c. 47. Orig. Hom. ii. in 1 Reg. l. c. and Hom. in Numb. 26. 4. *Münscher* von Cölln, i. p. 57, 58.

(4) *Cypr.* adv. Demetr. p. 196, and tract. de mortalitate in various places; he expresses, *e. g.* his hope, that those who die in consequence of pestilence, will come at once to Christ, p. 158, 164, (where he appeals to the example of Enoch) 166. *Rettberg,* p. 345.

(5) *Neander,* Gnost. Systeme, p. 141, ss. [" *The Gnostics taught, that the soul of the perfect Gnostic, having risen again at baptism, and being enabled by perfection of knowledge to conquer the Demiurgus, or Principle of Evil, would ascend, as soon as it was freed from the body, to the heavenly Pleroma, and dwell there for ever in the presence of the Father: while the soul of him, who had not been allowed while on earth to arrive at such a plenitude of knowledge, would pass through several transmigrations, till it was sufficiently purified to wing its flight to the Pleroma.*" *Burton,* Bampton Lecture, v. Lect. p. 131.]

(6) The views of *Clement* on this subject are expressed in still more general terms, Pæd. iii. 9, towards the end, p. 282, (Sylb. p. 241,) and Strom. vii. 6, p. 851, (709 S.): Φαμὲν δ' ἡμεῖς ἁγιάζειν τὸ πῦρ, οὐ τὰ κρέα, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἁμαρτωλοὺς ψυχάς· πῦρ οὐ τὸ πάμφαγον καὶ βάναυσον, ἀλλὰ τὸ φρόνιμον λέγοντες· τὸ διϊκνούμενον διὰ ψυχῆς τῆς διερχομένης τὸ πῦρ. From the whole context it appears that he speaks of the purifying efficacy of a mystical fire even *during the present life*, perhaps in allusion to Matth. iii. 11. Luke iii. 16. *Origen*, on the other hand, referring to 1 Cor. iii. 12, considers the fire which will consume the world at the last day, at the same time as a πῦρ καθάρσιον, contra Cels. v. 15. None (not even Paul or Peter himself) can escape this fire, but it does not cause any pain to the pure (according to Is. xliii. 2.) It is a second sacramentum regenerationis: and as the baptism of blood was compared with the baptism of water (see above, § 72, note 10,) so Origen thought that this *baptism of fire* at the end of the world would be necessary in the case of those who have forfeited the baptism of the Spirit; in the case of all others it will be a fire of probation. Comp. in Exod. Hom. vi. 4, in Psalm Hom. iii. 1, in Luc. Hom. xiv. Opp. iii. p. 948, xxiv. p. 961, in Jerem. Hom. ii. 3, in Ezech. Hom. i. 13, comp. *Redepenning* on p. 235. *Guerike,* de schola al. ii. p. 294. *Thomasius,* p. 250.

§ 78.

STATE OF THE BLESSED AND THE DAMNED.—RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.

Cotta, J. F., historia succincta dogmatis de pœnarum infernalium duratione, Tüb. 1744. *Dietelmaier, J. A.*, Commenti fanatici ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων historia antiquior. Altorf. 1769. 8.

Various expressions were used to denote the state of the blessed. The idea that different degrees of blessedness are proportionate to the different degrees of virtue exhibited in this life, was in accordance with the views of most of the Fathers of this period concerning the doctrine of moral freedom.(1) From this idea the transition was easy to another, viz. that of a further developement after the present life. *Origen* in particular carried out this latter notion,(2) and endeavoured to avoid as much as possible all sensuous representations of the pleasures of the future world, and to place them in purely spiritual enjoyments.(3) Notions more or less gross prevailed concerning the punishment of the wicked, which most of the Fathers regarded as *eternal*.(4) From the very nature of the thing it is evident, that purely spiritual views on this subject could not reasonably be expected. Origen himself imagined the bodies of the damned to be black.(5) But as he looked upon evil more as the negation of good, than as something positive, he was induced by his idealistic tendency, to set limits even to hell, and to expect a final remission of the punishment of the wicked at the restitution of all things. But in popular discourses he retained the common idea of eternal punishment.(6)

(1) According to *Justin M.*, the blessedness of heaven mainly consists in the continuation of the blessedness of the millennial reign, the only difference being the enjoyment of immediate intercourse with God, Apol. i. 8. *Semisch*, ii. p. 477. Different names were given even to the intermediate states before the resurrection (comp. the preceding §, note 6.) This was also the case with the abode of the blessed. Thus *Irenæus*, v. 36, p. 337, (460, Gr.) makes a distinction between *οὐρανός*, *παράδεισος* and *πόλις*, and endeavours to prove the existence of different habitations from Matth. xiii. 8, and John xiv. 2. *Clement* of Alexandria also adopted the idea of different degrees of blessedness. Strom. iv. 6. p. 579, 80, (488, 89, S.) vi. 14, 793, (668, S.) and *Orig.* de princip. ii. 11. Opp. i. p. 104.

(2) According to *Origen*, l. c. the blessed dwell in the aërial regions (1 Thess. iv. 17), and take notice of what happens in the air. Immediately after their departure from this earth, they go first to paradise (eruditionis locus, auditorium vel schola animarum); as they grow in knowledge and piety, they proceed on their journey from paradise to higher regions, and having passed through various mansions which the Scripture calls heavens, they arrive at last at the kingdom of heaven, properly so called. He too appeals to John xiv. 2, and maintains that pro-

gress is possible even in the kingdom of heaven (desire and perfection.) Comp. *Redepenning.* Origines, ii. p. 340, ss.

(3) In the same place, de princ. ii. 11, Origen describes in strong terms the sensuous expectations of those, qui magis delectationi suæ quodammodo ac libidini indulgentes, solius litteræ disciputi arbitrantur repromissiones futúras in voluptate et luxuria corporis expectandas. He himself, attaching too much importance to the intellectual, supposes the principal enjoyment of the future life to consist in the gratification of the desire after knowledge, which God would not have given us, if he had not designed to satisfy it. While on earth we trace the outlines of the picture which will be finished in heaven. The objects of future knowledge are, as we might naturally expect, for the most part of a theological character; as an allegorical interpreter, he would think it of great importance that we should then fully understand all the types of the Old Test. p. 105; Tunc intelliget etiam de sacerdotibus et levitis et de diversis sacerdotalibus ordinibus rationem, et cujus forma erat in Moyse, et nihilominus quæ sit veritas apud Deum jubilæorum et septimanas annorum; sed et festorum dierum et feriarum rationes videbit et omnium sacrificiorum et purificationum intuebitur causas; quæ sit quoque ratio lepræ purgationis et quæ lepræ diversæ, et quæ purgatio sit eorum qui seminis profluvium patiuntur, advertet; et agnoscet quoque, quæ et quantæ qualesque virtutes sint bonæ, quæque nihilominus contrariæ, et qui vel illis affectus sit hominibus, vel istis contentiosa æmulatio; the knowledge, however, of metaphysics, and even of natural philosophy is not excluded: Intuebitur quoque, quæ sit ratio animarum, quæve diversitas animalium vel eorum, quæ in aquis vivunt, vel avium, vel ferarum, quidve sit, quod in tam multas species singula genera deducuntur, qui creatoris prospectus, vel quis per hæc singula sapientiæ ejus tegitur sensus. Sed et agnoscet, qua ratione radicibus quibusdam vel herbis associantur quædam virtutes, et aliis e contrario herbis vel radicibus depelluntur. We shall also have a clear insight into the destinies of man, and the dealings of providence. In a higher region we shall be instructed *e. g.* concerning the stars, "why a star occupies such and such a position, why it stands at such and such a distance from another," etc. But the highest and last degree is the intuitive vision of God himself, the complete elevation of the spirit above the region of sense. The blessed do

not stand in need of any other food. Comp. de princip. iii. 318. 321. and Tom. xx. in Joh. (Opp. iv. p. 315.): Ὅτε μὲν ὁ ἑωρακῶς τὸν υἱὸν, ἑώρακε τόν πατέρα· ὅτε δε ὡς ὁ υἱὸς ὁρᾷ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὄψεταί τις, οἱονεὶ ὁμοίως τῷ υἱῷ αὐτόπτης ἔσται τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐκέτι ἀπὸ τῆς εἰκόνος ἐννοῶν τὰ περὶ τούτου, οὗ ἡ εἰκών ἐστι. Καὶ νομίζω γε τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ τέλος, ὅταν παραδίδωσι τὴν βασίλειαν ὁ υἱὸς τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρι, καὶ ὅτε γίνεται ὁ θεὸς τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν (1 Cor. xv. 28.) The interpretation of Origen forms a remarkable contrast with the sensuous and rhetorical description of *Cyprian*, which is to be connected with his hierarchico-ascetic tendency; the latter has, however, more of an ecclesiastical character, and enjoys greater popularity than the former, because it has also regard to the wants of the mind (the meeting again of individuals, etc.), de mortalitate, p. 166: Quis non ad suos navigare festinans, ventum prosperum cupidius optaret, ut velociter caros liceret amplecti? Patriam nostram Paradisum computamus, parentes Patriarchas habere jam cœpimus: quid non properamus et currimus, ut patriam nostram videre, ut parentes salutare possimus? Magnus illic nos carorum numerus expectat, parentum, fratrum, filiorum frequens nos et copiosa turba desiderat, jam de sua immortalitate secura, et adhuc de nostra salute solicita. Ad horum conspectum et complexum venire quanta et illis et nobis in commune lætitia est? Qualis illic cœlestium regnorum voluptas sine timore moriendi et cum æternitate vivendi? quam summa et perpetua felicitas? Illic apostolorum gloriosus chorus, illic prophetarum exultantium numerus, illic martyrum innumerabilis populus ob certaminis et passionis victoriam coronatus; triumphantes illic virgines, quæ concupiscentiam carnis et corporis continentiæ robore subegerunt; remunerati misericordes, qui alimentis et largitionibus pauperum justitiæ opera fecerunt, qui dominica præcepta servantes, ad cœlestes thesauros terrena patrimonia transtulerunt. Ad hos, fratres dilectissimi, avida cupiditate properemus, ut cum his cito esse, ut cito ad Christum venire contingat, optemus.

(4) *Clement* of Rome, Ep. 2, c. 8. (comp. c. 9:) Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἔτι δυνάμεθα ἐκεῖ ἐξομολογήσασθαι ἢ μετανοεῖν ἔτι. *Justin M.* also asserts the eternity of future punishments in opposition to Plato's doctrine, according to which they should only last a thousand years, Apol. i. 8. Coh. ad. Gr. c. 35. Thus *Minuc. Fel.* c. 35: Nec tormentis aut modus ullus aut terminus. Also *Cyprian*, ad Demetr. p. 195: Cremabit addictos

ardens semper gehenna, et vivacibus flammis vorax pœna, nec erit, unde habere tormenta vel requiem possint aliquando vel finem. Servabuntur cum corporibus suis animæ infinitis cruciatibus ad dolorem. P. 196: Quando istinc excessum fuerit, nullus jam pœnitentiæ locus est, nullus satisfactionis effectus: hic vita aut amittitur, aut tenetur, hic saluti æternæ cultu Dei et fructu fidei providetur.—The idea of eternal punishments is different from that of a total annihilation, which was propounded by *Arnobius* at the commencement of the following period. Some are disposed to find the first traces of this doctrine in *Justin M.* dial. cum Tryph. c. 5, where it is said that the souls of the wicked should be punished as long as *ἔστ᾽ ἂν αὐτὰς καὶ εἶναι καὶ κολάζεσθαι ὁ Θεὸς θέλῃ.* (Comp. on this passage *Semisch* ii. p. 480, 481.) Comp. also *Iren.* ii. 34: Quoadusque ea Deus et esse et perseverare voluerit, and Clement Hom. iii. 3.

(5) In accordance with the language of Scripture, fire was commonly represented as the instrument by which God executes his punishments. *Justin M.* speaks in various places of a *πῦρ αἰώνιον ἄσβεστον* (Apol. ii. 1. 2. 7. dial. c. Tr. § 130.) *Clement* of Alexandria, Coh. 47, (35,) calls it *πῦρ σωφρονοῦν*, *Tert.* Scorp. 4, and *Minuc. Fel.* 35, (afterwards also Jerome and others) call it ignis sapiens. It will be sufficient here to quote the passage of Minucius: Illic sapiens ignis membra urit et reficit, carpit et nutrit, sicut ignes fulminum corpora tangunt, nec absumunt. Sicut ignes Ætnæ et Vesuvii montis et ardentium ubiqe terrarum flagrant, nec erogantur, ita pœnale illud incendium non damnis ardentium pascitur, sed inexesa corporum laceratione nutritur. Comp. also *Tert.* Apol. c. 48, and *Cypr.* ad. Demetr. l. c., who thinks that the sight of these punishments is a kind of satisfaction to the blessed for the persecutions which they had to suffer while on earth. Hell was represented as a place, thus by *Justin M.*, Apol. i. 19: *Ἡ δὲ γεέννά ἐστι τόπος ἔνθα κολάζεσθαι, μέλλουσι οἱ ἀδίκως βιώσαντες καὶ μὴ πιστεύοντες ταῦτα γένήσεσθαι, ὅσα ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐδίδαξε.* As *Origen* imagined that spiritual enjoyments constitute the future blessedness, so he believed the misery of the wicked to consist in separation from God, the remorse of conscience, etc. de princ. ii. 10. Opp. i. p. 102. The eternal fire is neither material, nor kindled by another person, but the combustibles are our sins themselves, of which conscience reminds us; thus the fire of hell resembles the fire of passions in this world. The discord between the soul and God may be compared with the

pain which we suffer, when all the members of the body are torn out of their joints. By "outer darkness" Origen does not so much understand a place devoid of light, as a state of complete ignorance; he thus appears to adopt the idea of *black bodies* only by way of accommodation to popular notions. It should also be borne in mind, that Origen imagined that the design of all these punishments was to heal, or to correct, and thus finally to restore the sinner to the favour of God.

(6) De princ. i. 6. Opp. i. p. 70, 71, (quoted by *Münscher* von Cölln. i. p. 64, 65.) The ideas there expressed are connected with his general views on the character of God, the design of the Divine punishments, on liberty and the nature of evil, as well as with his demonology, and especially with his unwavering faith in the power of Christ's work to overcome all things (according to Ps. cx. 1, and 1 Cor. xv. 25.) At the same time, he frankly confessed, that his doctrine might easily become dangerous to the unconverted, contra Celsum vi. 26. Opp. i. p. 650. He therefore speaks at the very commencement of the 19. Hom. in Jerem. Opp. T. iii. p. 241, of eternal condemnation, even of the impossibility of being converted in the world to come. Nevertheless, in the same Hom. (p. 267,) he calls the fear of eternal punishment (according to Jer. xx. 7,) ἀπάτη, though it be beneficial in its effects, and brought about by God himself (a pedagogical artifice, as it were.) For many wise men, or such as thought themselves wise, having apprehended the (theoretical) truth respecting the Divine punishments, and rejected the delusion (beneficial in a practical point of view), gave themselves up to a vicious life, while it would have been much better for them to believe in the eternity of the punishments of hell.

SECOND PERIOD.

FROM THE DEATH OF ORIGEN TO JOHN DAMASCENUS, FROM THE YEAR 254—730.

THE AGE OF POLEMICS.

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE SECOND PERIOD.

§ 79.

INTRODUCTION.

De Wette, Christliche Sittenlehre, vol. ii. p. 294, ss. *Münscher*, Handbuch, vol. iii. section 1.

During this considerable space of time the *Polemics* of the church developed themselves in a much more remarkable manner than either the apologetical tendency of the preceding, or the systematic tendency of the next period. The time which elapsed from the Sabellian to the Monothelite controversy, presents the aspect of a series of contests, carried on *within* the church, about the most important doctrinal points. While in the preceding period all heretics separated from the church as a matter of course, we now see them striving for the victory, and it was for a long time uncertain which party would gain it. Orthodoxy, however, prevailed at last, partly from an internal necessity, partly through the assistance of the secular power, and the coincidence of external circumstances. Thus it happened that in after ages orthodoxy appeared as an obligation which man owes to the state; heresy, on the contrary, was considered a political crime.

§ 80.

DOCTRINAL DEFINITIONS AND CONTROVERSIES.

The three main pillars of the Christian system: *Theology, Christology,* and *Anthropology,* were the principal points on which the councils had to decide, and to express their opinion in confessions of faith. The controversies which contributed to bring about this result, are the following: *a. In reference to the Doctrine of the Trinity* (Theology): the Sabellian and the Arian controversies, with their branches, the Semiarian and the Macedonian. *b. Relative to the two Natures of Christ,* (Christology): the Apollinarian, Nestorian, Eutychian-Monophysite, and Monothelite controversies. *c. Concerning Anthropology and the Economy of Redemption:* the Pelagian, Semipelagian, and (in reference to the church) the Donatist controversies. The first eight took their rise in the East; the last three originated in the West, but both the eastern and western countries felt their effects. Hence disruptions were frequent between the eastern and western church, till at last the controversy respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost brought about a lasting breach.

Though the *controversy concerning images,* which principally agitated the East, and was also carried on in the West, turned in the first instance upon the form of worship, yet it exerted some indirect influence (especially in the East) upon the doctrinal definitions of the nature of God, the person of Christ, and the significance of the sacraments. But the further developement of the doctrine of the sacraments, and of eschatology was reserved for the next period. Concerning the external history of those controversies, see the works on ecclesiastical history.

§ 81.

THE DOGMATIC CHARACTER OF THIS PERIOD.—THE FATE OF ORIGENISM.

The more decidedly and systematically ecclesiastical orthodoxy was established, the more individual Christians lost the right of private judgment, and the more dangerous it became to embrace heretical opinions. The more liberal tendency of former theologians, such as *Origen,* so far from meeting with toleration, was subsequently condemned. But notwithstanding this external condemnation, the spirit of Origen continued to animate the theologians of the East, though it was kept within narrower limits. His works were also made known in the West by Jerome and Rufinus, and exerted some influence even upon his opponents.

The principal *followers* of Origen were *Dionysius,* bishop of Alexandria, *Pamphilus, Gregory Thaumaturgus,* and others. Among his opponents *Methodius* (bishop of Lycia, and afterwards of Tyrus, died A.D. 311,) occupied the most conspicuous position. On the further controversies relative to the doctrinal tenets of Origen under the Emperor Justinian I., and their condemnation brought about (A. D. 544,) by *Mennas,* bishop of Constantinople, see the works on ecclesiastical history.

§ 82.

THEOLOGIANS OF THIS PERIOD.

Among the number of those theologians of the eastern church, who have either exerted the greatest influence upon the developement of the doctrines, or composed works on doctrinal subjects, are the following :—*Eusebius of Cæsarea,*(1) *Eusebius of Nicomedia,*(2) but principally *Athanasius,*(3) *Basil the Great,*(4) *Gregory of Nyssa,*(5) and *Gregory of Nazianzum,*(6) (the last three of Cappadocia; then: *Chrysostom,*(7) *Cyrill of Jerusalem,*(8) *Epiphanius,*(9) *Ephraim the Syrian,*(10) *Nemesius,*(11) *Cyrill of Alexandria,* (12) *Theodore of Mopsuestia,*(13) *Theodoret, bishop of Cyrus;* (14) in the West: *Arnobius,*(15) *Lactantius,*(16) *Hilary of Poitiers,*(17) *Jerome,*(18) *Ambrose,*(19) and, above all, *Augustine.*(20) These are followed by some others of greater or less importance: *John Cassian,*(21) *Vincentius Lerinensis,*(22) *Salvian,*(23) *Leo I. surnamed the Great,*(24) *Prosper of Aquitania,*(25) *Gennadius,*(26) *Fulgentius of Ruspe,*(27) *Boëthius,*(28) *Gregory the Great,*(29) and *Isidore Hispalensis.*(30) The last is of importance, inasmuch as he collected the materials already in existence, and may be considered the forerunner of John Damascenus (in the East.)

(1) *Eusebius* (Pamphili), bishop of Cæsarea (author of the ecclesiastical history), was born about the year 261, and died 340. Of his dogmatical works the following may be mentioned (in addition to the prologue to his ecclesiastical history): Εὐαγγελικῆς ἀποδείξεως παρασκευή (præparatio evangelica), Ed. i. of Steph. 1544, ss. Cum not. *F. Vigeri,* 1628, Col. 1688, fol.—Εὐαγγελικὴ ἀπόδειξις (demonstratio evangelica), Ed. of Steph. 1545, Cum not. *Rich. Montacutii,* 1628, Lips. 1688, fol.—Κατὰ Μαρκέλλου, ii.—Περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ϑεολογίας, τῶν πρὸς Μάρκελλον.—Epistola de fide Nicæna ad Cæsareenses, and some exegetical treatises.

(2) *Eusebius of Nicomedia,* formerly bishop of Berytus, and afterwards of Constantinople, died A. D. 340. He was the leader of the Eusebian party in the Arian controversy. His opinions are given in the works of Athanasius, Sozomen, Theodoret, (comp. especially his Epistola ad Paulianum Tyri Episcopum in Theod. i. 6,) and Philostorgius. Comp. *Fabric.* Bibl. Gr. vol. vi. p. 109, ss.[a]

(3) *Athanasius,* commonly called the father of orthodoxy, was

---

[a] The homilies of *Eusebius of Emisa* (who died A. D. 360), are only of secondary importance relative to the doctrine of the descensus ad inferos. Opusc. ed. *Augusti,* Elberf. 1829. *Thilo,* über die Schriften des Euseb von Alex. und des Euseb von Emisa, Halle, 1832.

born at Alexandria about the year 296, occupied the episcopal see of that city from the year 326, and died A. D. 373; he exerted a considerable influence upon the formation of the Nicene Creed, and took a prominent part in the Arian controversy. Of his numerous dogmatical works the most important are: *Λόγος κατὰ Ἑλλήνων* (an apologetical treatise); *λόγος περὶ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ λόγου καὶ τῆς διὰ σώματος πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐπιφανείας αὐτοῦ.*—*Ἔκθεσις πίστεως* (expositio fidei Nicænæ.)—*Πρὸς τοὺς ἐπισκόπους Αἰγύπτου καὶ Λιβύης ἐπιστολὴ ἐγκυκλικὸς κατὰ Ἀρειανῶν.*—Oratt. v. contra Arianos.—Homilies, letters, etc. The principal EDITIONS are: that of the Benedictine monks (of Montfaucon), 1689-98, ii. f. ed. *N. A. Giustiniani*, Patav. et Lips. 1777, iv. f. Comp. *Tillemont*, T. viii. *Rössler*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, vol. v. MONOGRAPHIES: †*Möhler*, Athanasius der Grosse und die Kirche seiner Zeit, Mainz. 827. ii. 8. *Böhringer*, die Kirche Christi, i. 2, p. 1, ss.

(4) *Basil* of Neocæsarea, surnamed the Great, was born A. D. 316, and died A. D. 379; he is of importance in the Arian and Macedonian controversies. HIS PRINCIPAL WRITINGS are: *Ἀνατρεπτικὸς τοῦ ἀπολογητικοῦ τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Εὐνομίου* (libri v contra Eunomium), *περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, numerous letters and homilies (in Hexaëmeron 11.—in Ps. xvii.—diversi argumenti 31 Sermones 25.) EDITIONS of his works were published by *Fronto Ducæus* and *Morellius*, Par. 1618, 38, ii. (iii.) f.; by the Benedictine monks in the year 1688, iii. fol. and by **Garnier*, Paris, 1721—30, iii. f. MONOGRAPHIES: *Feisser*, de vita Basilii Gron. 1828. **Klose, C. R. W.*, Basilius der Gr. nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre, Stralsund, 1835, 8. *A. Jahn*, Basilius M. platonizans, Bern. 1838, 4. *Böhringer*, i. 2, p. 152, ss.

(5) *Gregory of Nyssa*, a brother of Basil, a native of Cappadocia, died about the year 394. His principal work is: *Λόγος κατηχητικὸς ὁ μέγας.*—He also composed dogmatico-exegetical works on the creation of the world and of man, wrote treatises against Eunomius and Apollinaris, and was the author of several homilies, ascetic tracts, etc. Though he strictly adhered to the Nicene Creed, yet he was distinguished for the mildness of his disposition; "*the profoundness of his scientific knowledge, as well as his peculiarities assign to him the first place among the followers of Origen.*" (*Hase.*) His works were edited by *Morellius*, Par. 1615, ii. f. Append. by *Gretser*, Par. 1618. Of the Benedictine edition (Paris, 1780) only the first volume has appeared. Some newly discovered treatises against the Arians

and Macedonians are published in *A. Maii* Scriptt. vet. Coll. Rom. 834. T. viii. MONOGRAPHIES: *Rupp, Jul.*, Gregors, des Bischofs von Nyssa, Leben und Meinungen, Lipz. 1834. *Böhringer*, i. 2, p. 275, ss.

(6) *Gregory of Nazianzum*, surnamed the theologian, was born about the year 300 at Arianzus, near Nazianzum, was afterwards bishop of Constantinople, and died A. D. 390. His PRINCIPAL WORKS are: In Julianum Apostatam invectiva duo, (published separately by *Montagu*, 1610, 4.)—*Λόγοι ϑεολογικοί*.—He also composed numerous orations, letters, poems, and shorter treatises. His works were published by *Morellius*, Paris 1630, ii. f. (Lips. 1690.) Of the Benedictine edition only the first volume has appeared. [It is *now* completed, vol. i. 1778, vol. ii. 1840.] MONOGRAPHIES: **Ullmann*. Gregor von Nazianz, der Theologe, Darmst. 1825. *Böhringer*, i. 2, p. 357, ss.

(7) *Chrysostom*, was born at Antioch in Syria about the year 344, occupied the episcopal see of Constantinople, and died A. D. 407. His practico-exegetical and homiletical writings are still more valuable than his strictly dogmatical works; at the same time, he is of importance in the history of doctrines on account of this very practical tendency. Thus his views on the freedom of the will form a strong contrast to those of Augustine. In addition to his numerous homilies and sermons we have: *περὶ ἱεροσύνης*, lib. vi.(edited by *Bengel*, Stuttg. 1825, by *Leo*, Lips. 1834), de providentia, lib. iii.—EDITIONS OF HIS COMPLETE WORKS were published by *Savile*, Eton, 1612. *Fronto Ducæus*, Par. 1609—36. **Bern. de Montfaucon*, Paris, 1718—31. xiii. fol. Venet. 1755, xiii. f. ib. 1780, xiv. f.—MONOGRAPHIES: **Neander*, der heil. Chrysostomus und die Kirche des Orients in dessen Zeitalter, Berlin, 1821, 22. ii. 8, and [*Butler, J. D.*, the Life of John Chrysostom. Bibliotheca Sacra, i. p. 669, ss.] *Böhringer*, i. 4, p. 1, ss.

(8) *Cyrill of Jerusalem*, formerly an Eusebian, went over to the Nicene party, and combated the strict Arian Acacius; he died A. D. 386. He distinguished himself by his catechetical works, (347), in which he propounded the doctrines of the church in a popular style. His five mystagogical discourses are of special importance in the dogmatic point of view. His works were edited by *Milles*, Oxon. 1703, f. and by **Ant. Aug. Touttée*, (after his death by *Prud. Maran*), Par. 1720, f. Ven. 1763, f. Comp. *von Cölln*, in Ersch u. Grubers Encyklopädie, vol. xxii. p. 148, ss.

(9) *Epiphanius* of Besanduc near Eleutheropolis in Palestine, bishop of Constantia in the isle of Cyprus, died at the age of nearly one hundred years, A. D. 404. The work which he wrote against heretics: Αἱρεσέων LXXX, ἐπικληθὲν πανάριος εἴπ' οὖν κιβώτιος (adv. hær.) is a source for the history of doctrines. The theology of Epiphanius consisted in rigid adherence to the orthodox system rather than in the formation of original views. It is represented in the treatise: περιοχὴ λόγου τοῦ 'Επιφ. τοῦ ἀγκυρωτοῦ καλουμενου, which may be compared with his works: λόγος εἰς τὴν Κυρίου ἀνάστασιν—εἰς τὴν ἀνάληψιν τοῦ Κυρίου λόγος, etc. There is an EDITION of his works by **Petavius*, Par. 1622, fol. ib. 1630, f. edit. auct. Colon. (Lips.) 1682, ii. fol.

(10) *Ephraim*, Propheta Syrorum, of Nisibis in Mesopotamia, abbot and deacon in a monastery at Edessa, died about the year 378. He gained a high reputation by his exegetical works, and rendered signal service to Syria by the introduction of Grecian science and dogmatic terminology. Opp. ed. **J. S. Assemani*, Rom. 1732, 46, vi. fol. comp. *C. A. Lengerke*, de Ephræmo Sc. S. interprete, Hal. 1828, 4.

(11) *Nemesius*, bishop of Emisa in Phœnicia (?), lived about the year 400. His treatise: περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου was formerly attributed to Gregory of Nyssa. Oxon. 1671, 8. Comp. *Schröckh* Kirchengeschichte, vol. vii. p. 157.

(12) *Cyrill of Alexandria*, (died A. D. 444), is well known by his violent proceedings against Nestor, and by his Monophysite tendency. Beside homilies and exegetical works, he wrote anathemas against Nestor, treatises on the Trinity, the incarnation of Christ, περὶ τῆς ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ λατρείας xvii. books.—κατὰ ἀνθρωπομορφιτῶν—and a work in defence of Christianity against the Emperor Julian in 10 books.—Extracts of it are given by *Rössler*, vol. viii. p. 43–152. EDITIONS of his works were published by **J. Aubertus*, Lut. 1638, vii. fol. and *A. Maii*, Collectio T. viii.

(13) *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, was born about the year 350, and died A. D. 429. Of his writings we have scarcely more than fragments. Theodori quæ supersunt omnia, ed *A. F. Wegnern*, Berol. 1834, ss. comp. *Assemani* Bibl. orient. T. iii. pars. i. p. 30. *Fritzsche, O. F.*, de Theodori Mopsvhesteni vita et scriptis. Comment. hist. Hal. 1836, 8. A sketch of his (liberal) theology is given by *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 3. p. 929–944.

(14) *Theodoret* was born at Antioch, and died about the year

457. His dogmatico-polemical writings are of importance in the Nestorian and Monophysite controversies. Theodoret and Theodore are the representatives of the liberal tendency of the Antiochian school. The following work is a SOURCE for the history of doctrines: Αἱρετικῆς κακομυθίας ἐπιτομὴ, Lib. v. (fabulæ hæreticæ). He also composed several exegetical writings. There are EDITIONS of his works by *J. Sirmond*, Lutet. 1642. iv. fol. Auctuarium cura *J. Garnerii*, ib. 1684. f.—and *J. L. Schulze* u. *Nösselt*, Hal. 1769–74. 5 vols. 8.

(15) *Arnobius*, was born at Sicca Veneria in Numidia, the master of Lactantius, lived towards the close of the third, and at the commencement of the fourth century. He wrote a work under the title: adv. gentes libr. vii. which was edited by *J. C. Orelli*, Lips. 1816. Add. 1817.—His writings contain many heterodox assertions, like those of his disciple:

(16) *Lucius Cœlius Firmianus Lactantius* (Cicero christianus), he was born in Italy, became a rhetorician in Nicomedia, was tutor of *Crispus* (the eldest son of the Emperor Constantine) and died about the year 330. He wrote: Divinarum Institutt. libri vii; de ira Dei; de opificio Dei vel de formatione hominis.—EDITIONS of his works were published by *Bünemann*, Lips. 1739, by *Le Brun* and *Dufresnoi*, Par. 1748, ii. 4. and *O. F. Fritzsche*, Lips. 1842–44. Comp. *Ammon, F. G. Ph.* Lactantii opiniones de religione in systema redactæ, Diss. ii. Erl. 1820. *Spyker*, de pretio institutionibus Lactantii tribuendo, Lgd. 1826.

(17) *Hilary*, (Hilarius), bishop of Pictavium (Poitiers) in Gaul, died A. D. 368. Beside commentaries on the Psalms and on Matthew, and several minor treatises, he wrote: de trinitate libr. xii. EDITIONS of his works were published by the Benedictine monks, Par. 1693. f. by *Maffei*, Ver. 1730. ii. f. and by *Oberthür*, Würzb. 1785–88. iv. 8. *A. Maii*, Scriptt. vet. Coll. T. vi.

(18) *Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus* (Jerome), was born about the year 331 at Stridon in Dalmatia, and died as a monk in a monastery at Bethlehem A. D. 420. In his earlier years he was a disciple of Origen, but turned afterwards his opponent, and espoused orthodoxy, which he zealously defended; he possessed great talents, and was a man of profound learning. ("*He made the West acquainted with Grecian and Hebrew erudition.*" *Hase.*) He rendered greater service to biblical criticism and exegesis (by the Vulgate-version), as well as to literary history

(by his work de viris illustribus), than to dogmatic theology. Concerning the latter, it may rather be said, that he preserved it like a relic which he had rescued from the Origenist deluge, than that he exerted any powerful and original influence upon the healthy developement of the doctrines in general. His controversial writings and letters are partly directed against the opponents of monachism, of the worship of relics, of celibacy, of the adoration of the Virgin, etc., which he greatly admired; and have partly regard to the Pelagian and Origenist controversies. The following are the principal EDITIONS of his works: Opp. cura *Erasmi,* Bas. 1516. ix. f. that of the Benedictine monks (by *Martianay* and *Pouget*), Par. 1693–706. v. f., and that of *Vallarsius,* Veron. 1734–42. xi. f. Ed. 2. Venet. 1766–72. iv. (Luther judged unfavourably of him.)

(19) *Ambrose,* was born A. D. 340, occupied the archiepiscopal see of Milan from the year 374, and died A. D. 398. He was the chief pillar of the Nicene orthodoxy in the West, and exerted considerable practical influence upon Augustine. Of his doctrinal writings we mention: Hexaëmeron, l. vi.; de officiis iii.; de incarnationis dominicæ sacramento; de fide libri v.; de Spiritu lib. iii.; and several others. He also composed some exegetical works, however some, under his name, are spurious (Ambrosiaster.) The principal EDITIONS of his works are that of *Amerbach,* Bas. 1492.—and the Benedictine edition cura *N. Nuriti* et *Jac. Frischii,* Par. 686–90. ii. f. Comp. *Böhringer,* i. 3. p. 1, ss.

(20) *Aurelius Augustine,* was born at Tagaste in Numidia, A. D. 354, died as bishop of Hippo Regius A. D. 430; on his eventful and deeply interesting life compare his auto-biography entitled confessiones libri xiii. (a manual edition of which was published at Berlin 1823, with a preface by *Neander*), and Possidius (Possidonius); on his writings compare his own retractationes. A great part of his works consists of polemical writings, in which he opposed the *Manichæans, Pelagians* and *Donatists.* All his works, and their different editions, are enumerated in the work of *Schönemann,* T. ii. p. 8, ss. A. PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS: contra academicos—de vita beata—de ordine ii.—soliloquia ii.—de immortalitate animæ etc. B. POLEMICAL WRITINGS: a) *against the Manichæans:* de moribus ecclesiæ cathol. et Manichæorum ii.—de libero arbitrio iii.—de genesi contra Manich.—de genesi ad litteram xii.—de vera religione—de utilitate credendi—de fide et symbolo et al. b) *against the Pelagians and Semipela-*

gians: (they are contained for the most part in vol. x. of the Benedictine edition) de gestis Pelagii—de peccatorum meritis et remissione—de natura et gratia—de perfectione justitiæ hominis—de gratia Christi et de peccato originali—contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum—contra Julian. lib. vi.—de gratia et libero arbitrio—de correptione et gratia—de prædestinatione Sanctorum—de dono perseverantiæ—contra secundam Juliani responsionem, opus imperfectum. c) *against the Donatists:* (in vol. ix.) contra Parmenianum iii.—de baptismo vii.—contra litteras Petiliani iii.—Ep. ad Catholicos (de unitate ecclesiæ) et al. C. DOGMATICAL WORKS: de civitate Dei ad Marcellin. libr. xxii. (*A manual edition of which was published by Tauchnitz. Lips. 1825. ii. 8)—de doctrina christiana lib. iv.—Enchiridion ad Laurentium s. de fide, spe et caritate—de fide—de trin. xv. D. PRACTICAL WORKS (de catechizandis rudibus)—E. EXEGETICAL WRITINGS, letters, sermons, etc. EDITIONS of his works were published by *Erasmus*, Bas. 1529. x. 1543, 56, 69, in xi. by the *Benedictine monks, Paris 1679–1701, xi. (in 8 vol.) Antwerp 1700–1703. xi. f. Append. by *Clericus*, ib. 1703 f.—*J. B. Albrizzi*, Ven. 1729–35. xii. f. 1756–69. xviii. 4. Opp. omnia, supplem. ed. *Hier Vignier*. Par. 1654, 55, ii. f.—* *Wiggers*, pragmatische Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus, Berl. 1821. Hamb. 1833, ii. 8. **Bindemann* der h. Augustin, Berl. 1844. *Böhringer*, i. 3, p. 99, ss,

(21) *John Cassian*, a pupil of Chrysostom, was probably a native of one of the western countries, founded Semipelagianism, and died about the year 440. De institut. cœnob. lib. xii.—Collationes Patrum xxiv.—de incarnatione Christi adv. Nestorium, libr. vii. The principal *editions* of his works are: Ed. princ. Bas. 1485. Lugd. 1516. 8. Lips. 1733. Comp. *Wiggers*, vol. ii. and his Diss. de Joanne Cassiano, Rost. 1824, 5.

(22) *Vincentius Lerinensis* (Lirinensis), a monk and presbyter in the monastery in the isle of Lerinum, near the coast of Gallia Narbonica, died about the year 450. Commonitoria duo pro catholicæ fidei antiquitate et universitate adv. profanas omnium hæreticorum novitates. There is an EDITION of this work by *Jo. Costerii* et *Edm. Campiani*, Col. 1600. 12. (last edition by *Herzog*, Vratislav. 1839.) comp. *Wiggers*, ii. p. 208, ss.

(23) *Salvian*, a native of Gaul, wrote: adv. avaritiam lib. iv. He composed a work on the doctrine of providence which is of im-

portance in dogmatic theology: de gubernatione Dei (de providentia,) Editions Bas. 1530. *Venet. (*Baluz.*) 1728. 8 (together with Vinc. Lerin. Par. 1684, 8.)

(24) *Leo the Great,* bishop of Rome, died A. D. 461. He is of importance in the Monophysite controversy, by the influence which he exerted upon the decisions of the council of Chalcedon. He composed sermons and letters, Ed. i. Rom. 1479 Rom. 1753–55. cura *P. Th. Cacciari.* Comp. *Griesbach, J. J.*, loci theologici collecti ex Leone Magno. (Opusc. T. i. ab. init.) **Perthel,* Pabst Leo's I. Leben und Lehren. Jena 1843, 8. *Böhringer,* i. 4, p. 170, ss.

(25) *Prosper of Aquitania* opposed the Pelagians in several writings; Carmen de ingratis, and others. Opp. by *Jean Le Brun de Maret* and *Mangeant,* Par. 1711. fol. *Wiggers,* ii. p. 136, ss.

(26) *Gennadius,* a presbyter at Massilia, died about the year 493: de ecclesiasticis dogmatibus, edited by *Elmenhorst,* Hamb. 1614, 4; it is also found among the works of Augustine (T. viii.)

(27) *Fulgentius* was born A. D. 468 at Telepte in Africa, and died A. D. 533, as bishop of Ruspe. Contra objectiones Arianorum—de remissione peccatorum—ad Donatum de fide orthod. et de diversis erroribus hæreticorum. There is an edition of his works by **J. Sirmond,* Par. 1623, fol. (Bibl. max. Patr. Lugd. T. ix. p. 1.) Ven. 1742, fol.

(28) *Anicius Manlius Torquatus Severianus Boëthius,* was born at Rome A. D. 470, and beheaded A. D. 524, in the reign of King Theodoric; he wrote: de trin. etc.: de persona et natura (contra Eutychem et Nestorium):—fidei confessio s. brevis fidei christianæ complexio. He also composed several philosophical writings, among which that entitled de consolatione philosophica lib. v. is worthy of notice, inasmuch as it shows how the ancient philosophy of the Stoics was associated with the speculative dogmatic theology of the church without being much influenced by the spirit of true Christianity. *Schleiermacher* even questions: "*whether Boëthius ever was a true Christian,*" Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 175.

(29) *Gregory the Great,* (bishop of Rome, A. D. 590), died A. D. 604. Protestants regard him commonly, but without sufficient reason, as the last of the Fathers in point of time. Opp. Par. 1675. Venet. 1768–76.—*Wiggers,* de Gregorio Magno ejusque placitis anthropologicis. Comment. i. 1838, 4. *G. J. Th. Lau,*

Gregor i. der grosse, nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre. Leipz. 1845. *Böhringer*, i. 4, p. 310, ss

(30) *Isidore Hispalensis,* died A. D. 633; he attempted, previous to the time of John Damascenus, to arrange the doctrines of the church in the form of a system, but his work is little better than a compilation: Sententiarum sive de summo bono libri iii. Opp. ed *Faust. Arevalo*, Rom. 1797, vii. 4. He wrote moreover some original works on doctrinal subjects: Liber quæstionum sive expositionis sacramentorum—de natura rerum—exhort. ad pœnitentiam—and, lastly, he composed several historical, canonical, and practical treatises. *Oudin,* Comment. vol. i. p. 1582—96.

§ 83.

THE EASTERN CHURCH FROM THE FOURTH TO THE SIXTH CENTURY.

The Schools of Alexandria and Antioch.

Münter, Dr. F., über die antiochenische Schule, in Stäudlins and Tzschirners Archiv. i. 1. p. 1, ss.

During this period an important change took place in the theological sentiments of the school of Alexandria. Formerly it had been the seat of enlightened Christianity, and of that idealistic theology, which did not rest satisfied with the popular system of literal interpretation; during the present period the doctrinal tendency of the school of Egypt was on the contrary altogether realistic. As it had once been the task of the Alexandrian school, so it became now the task of the *School of Antioch,* to defend a more liberal theology against the rude attacks of the narrow-minded advocates of what was then understood as orthodoxy. The consequence was, that the teachers of that school shared the same fate with Origen—they were treated as heretics. The school of Antioch, however, so far from resembling the earlier Alexandrian school, in giving countenance to the arbitrary system of allegorical interpretation, adopted the grammatical interpretation, to which, [as well as to biblical criticism in general], they thus rendered signal service. But on this account they have also sometimes been charged with a want of spirituality.

The change of opinions respecting classical literature, which many thought irreconcilable with the spirit of the gospel (the dream of Jerome in his Epist. ad Eustachium, comp. *Ullmann*, Gregor von Nazianzum, p. 543.) could not but exert a prejudicial influence upon the critical judgment of commentators.

§ 84.

THE WESTERN CHURCH.—AUGUSTINISM.

About the same time a new era commences in the history of doctrines with the appearance of Augustine. From the dogmatic point of view the West now assumes a higher degree of importance than the East, which exhausts itself in the controversies respecting the nature of Christ, and the worship of images. The realistic tendency of the church of Rome, (a tendency which had always been represented by the western churches), gradually gains the ascendancy over the hellenistic idealism of past ages; the philosophy of Aristotle supplants that of Plato. Augustine sows in his theology the seeds of two systems, which more than a thousand years afterwards were to wage open war against each other. The Roman-Catholic system was based on his doctrine of the church (in opposition to the Donatists); the system of evangelical Protestantism rests upon his views on original sin, free grace, and predestination (in opposition to the Pelagians.) But both these systems appear harmoniously connected in his own person, and are founded no less on the position which he occupied relative to the church, and to his opponents, than on the experience of his own life.

§ 85.

THE HERESIES.

With regard to the heresies respecting the nature of Christ which prevailed during the first period, the Ebionitic (judaizing) heresy may be considered as entirely suppressed.(1) The Gnostic (antijudaizing) tendency on the contrary, was more firmly established in the *system of Manes* (Manichæism), which, as complete dualism, was the opponent of Christianity, and from its very nature belonged to that form of oriento-pagan philosophy which had not then disappeared.(2) The system of the followers of *Priscillian* must be regarded as a continuation of Gnosticism, though modified by Manichæism; it spread in the West in the course of the fourth century, but was suppressed by violent persecutions.(3) Even the *Paulicians* manifested a leaning towards Gnostico-Manichæan notions, though they appeared at first to have been driven by the prevailing want of practical godliness in the church, to return to the simplicity of apostolical Christianity.(4) These heresies, which are, as it were, the younger branches which the old stock of Gnosticism continued to shoot forth, must be distinguished from those which arose during the present period in consequence of a philosophical treatment of separate doctrines, viz.: 1. The heresies of *Sabellius* and *Paul of Samosata*, with their opposites, the *Arian*, *Semiarian*, and *Eusebian* heresies (which continued to prevail among the Goths, Burgundians, and Vandals, long after they had been condemned.) 2. The heresy of the *Pelagians*, who never formed a distinct sect, but by means of a modified system (*Semipelagianism*) ever and anon crept into the church, from which they had been excluded by the more rigid decisions of several synods. 3. The *Nestorian* heresy with its opposites, the *Monophysite* and *Monothelite* heresies. The Nestorians, after having been defeated in Europe, succeeded in winning over to their party the Chaldeans, and the Thomas-Christians in Asia. The peculiar notions of the Monophysites are still entertained by the *Jacobites* and *Copts,* and those of the Monothelites exist to the present day among the *Maronites in Syria.*(5)

---

(1) Some writers have indeed numbered *Sabellianism* among the judaizing heresies, but without sufficient reason, for it arose entirely out of philosophical speculation, and was not, like Ebionitism, founded upon a national religion. The notions of the Pelagians concerning the meritoriousness of works bore some resemblance to Judaism, but they did not originate with it.

(2) *Manichæism* is distinguished from *Gnosticism* by a more complete developement of the dualistic principle; this also accounts for its rigid and uniform appearance, while Gnosticism is divided into many branches, and admits of more variety. There is far less of historical Christianity in Manichæism than in Gnosticism: it rests on its own historical foundation, which is at least partly an imitation of Christianity, and forms (like Mohammedanism at a later period) a separate system of religion rather than a sect. Comp. *Beausobre,* Histoire de Manichée et du Manichéisme, Amst. 1734, 2 vols. 4to. **Baur*, das manichäische Religionssystem, Tüb. 1831. *Trechsel, F.*, über den Kanon, die Kritik und Exegese der Manichäer, Bern. 1832. *Colditz, F. E.*, die Enstehung des manichäischen Religionssystems, Lpz. 1837, (where Manichæism is compared with the Indian, Persian, and other systems of religion.)

(3) On the history of the followers of Priscillian, which is of more importance in the history of the church, than in the history of doctrines, because they were the first heretics persecuted with the sword, comp. Sulp. Sev. hist. sacr. ii. 46–51. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 3, p. 1486, ss. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. p. 292, ss. *J. H. B. Lübkert*, de hæresi, Priscillianistarum. Havn. 1840.

(4) Further particulars may be found in *Schmid, Fr.*, historia Paulicianorum orientalium, Hafn. 1826; in an essay in Winer's and Engelhard's Journal 1827, vol. vii. parts 1 and 2; *Gieseler*, in the Studien und Kritiken, 1829, ii. 1, and *Neander* Kirchen-

geschichte, iii. p. 494, ss. Sources: Petri Siculi (who lived about the year 876) historia Manichæorum, gr. et lat. ed. *M. Raderus,* Ingolst. 1604. 4, newly edited, with a Latin translation, by *J. C. L. Gieseler*, Gött. 1846. 4. Photius adv. Paulianistas, s. rec. Manichæorum libr. iv. in *Gallandii* Bibl. PP. T. xiii. p. 603, ss.

(5) On all these heresies, which have a peculiar bearing upon the developement of doctrines during this period, comp. the special history of doctrines. Concerning the external history of the controversies themselves see the works on ecclesiastical history.

§ 86.

DIVISION OF THE MATERIAL.

Respecting the dogmatic material of this period we have to distinguish between:—1. *Those* doctrines, which owe their main developement to the controversies in which the catholic church was engaged with the aforesaid heretics; and, 2. *Those* which developed themselves more gradually.

To the former class belong *Theology* proper (the doctrine of the Trinity), *Christology*, and *Anthropology;* to the latter, those parts of theology, which treat of the attributes and character of God, creation, etc., as well as the doctrine of the sacraments, and eschatology. It must, however, be admitted, that they exerted a more or less considerable influence upon each other. We think it best to begin with the history of the first class of doctrines, which may be regarded as the pillars on which the whole structure rests, and then to pass to the second. The first class may be subdivided into two divisions, viz. the theologico-christological on the one, and the anthropological on the other hand. The controversies respecting the doctrines belonging to the former of these two divisions were principally carried on in the East, those concerning the latter in the West.

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE SECOND PERIOD.

FIRST CLASS.

THE CONTEST BETWEEN ORTHODOXY AND HERESY.

(POLEMICAL PART.)

FIRST DIVISION.

DOCTRINES RESPECTING THEOLOGY AND CHRISTOLOGY.

---

a. THEOLOGY PROPER.

§ 87.

THE RELATION OF THE FATHER TO THE SON.

Lactantius. Dionysius of Alexandria, and the followers of Origen.

The term *Logos*, respecting which the earlier Fathers so little agreed, that some understood by it the *Word*, others the *Wisdom*, (reason, spirit), was so indefinite that even *Lactantius*, who lived towards the commencement of the present period, made no distinction between the λόγος and the πνεῦμα.(1) Hence it happened that from the time of Origen it fell increasingly into disuse, and in its place the other term: *Son*, which, at all events, is more frequently employed in the New Test. in reference to the human nature of the historical Christ, was applied to the second person of the Godhead (previous to his incarnation.) The disciples of Origen,(2) in accordance with the sentiments of their master, understood by this second person a distinct hypostasis subordinate to the Father. Such is the view of *Dionysius of Alexandria;* but he endeavoured to clear himself from the charges brought forward against him by *Dionysius of Rome*, by putting forth his notions in a less offensive form.(3) The doctrine of Origen now met with a most remarkable fate. It consisted, as we have already seen, of two elements, viz. the hypostasis of the Son, and his subordination to the Father. The former was maintained in opposition to Sabellianism, and received as orthodox doctrine; the latter, on the contrary, was rejected, and, inasmuch as it was held by the Arians, condemned by the catholic church. Thus Origenism gained the victory on the one hand, but was defeated on the other. But by this very circumstance it is proved to be a necessary link in the chain, a necessary member of a series of systems which are connected by its means.

(1) The theology of *Lactantius* must be considered as an isolated phenomenon in the present period, and has always been regarded as heterodox. (Concerning his prevailing moral tendency, see *Dorner*, p. 777.) Lactantius, after having opposed the gross and sensuous interpretation of the birth of Christ: ex connubio ac permistione feminæ alicujus, Instit. div. iv. c. 8, returns to the meaning which the term *Word* (sermo) has in common life: Sermo est spiritus cum voce aliquid significante prolatus. The Son is distinguished from the angels, in that he is not only spiritus (breath, wind), but also the (spiritual) *Word.* The angels proceed from God only as taciti spiritus, as the breath comes out of the nose of man, while the Son is the breath which comes out of God's mouth, and forms articulate sounds; hence he identifies Sermo with the Verbum Dei, quia Deus procedentem de ore suo *vocalem* spiritum, quem non utero, sed mente conceperat, inexcogitabili quadam majestatis suæ virtute ac potentia, in effigiem, quæ proprio sensu ac sapientia vigeat, comprehendit. There is, however, a distinction between the word (Son) of God, and our words. Our words being mixed with the atmosphere, soon perish; yet even *we* may perpetuate them by committing them to writing—quanto magis Dei vocem credendum est et manere in æternum et sensu ac virtute comitari, quam de Deo Patre tanquam rivus de fonte traduxerit. Lactantius is so

far from holding the doctrine of the *Trinity*, that he finds it necessary to defend himself against the charge of believing not so much in *three*, as in *two* Gods. To justify his belief in the existence of two natures in the One God, he makes use of the same expressions which orthodox writers employed in later times for the purpose of defending the doctrine of the Trinity: Cum dicimus Deum Patrem et Deum Filium, non diversum dicimus, nec utrumque secernimus: quod nec Pater a Filio potest, nec Filius Patre secerni, siquidem nec Pater sine Filio potest nuncupari, nec Filius potest sine Patre generari. Cum igitur et Pater Filium faciat et Filius Patrem, una utrique mens, unus spiritus, una substantia est. He then comes back to the illustrations used before him, *e. g.* those drawn from the river and its source, the sun and its beams; he even surpasses his predecessors in comparing the Son of God with an earthly son, who, residing in the house of his father, has all things in common with him, so that the house may be named after the son, as well as after the father, (the Arians reasoned very much in the same way.)

(2) Thus *Pierius*, the master of Pamphilus of Cæsarea, was charged by Photius (Cod. 119.) with having maintained that the Father and the Son are two οὐσίαι καὶ φύσεις. Nevertheless he is said to have taught εὐσεβῶς, by employing those terms in the sense of ὑποστάσεις; but δυσσεβῶς by making the πνεῦμα inferior to both the Father and the Son. *Theognostus* was accused of considering the Son a κτίσμα; but this assertion is not in accordance with the otherwise orthodox teaching of that theologian, comp. *Dorner*, p. 733, ss. Some disciples of Origen, e. g. *Gregory Thaumaturgus* even manifested a leaning towards Sabellianism; according to Basil, ep. 210. 5. Gregorg. taught, πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν ἐπινοίᾳ μὲν εἶναι δύο, ὑποστάσει δὲ ἕν. *Methodius* of Patara avoided the use of the term ὁμοούσιος in reference to the pre-existence of the Son, which however he seems to have admitted, com. Opp. edit. *Combefis*. Par. 1644, p. 283–474, and *Dorner*, l. c.

(3) This is obvious, especially in the opposition which *Dionysius* offered to Sabellianism. Of his work addressed to the bishop of Rome and entitled: Ἔλεγχος καὶ Ἀπολογία, Lib. iv. fragments are preserved in the writings of Athanasius (περὶ Διονυσίου τοῦ ἐπ. Ἀλ. liber.: Opp. i. p. 243.) and Basil; they were collected by *Coustant* in his Epistt. Rom. Pontt. in *Galland*. T. iv. p. 495. See *Gieseler*, i. § 64. *Neander*, i. 3, p. 1037. *Münscher* von

Cölln, p. 197–200. *Schleiermacher* (see the next §.) p. 402, ss. According to Athanasius, p. 246, Dionysius was charged with having compared (in a letter to Euphranor and Ammonius) the relation subsisting between the Father and the Son to that in which the husbandman stands to the vine, the shipbuilder to the ship, etc. The Arians even asserted, (see Athanasius, p. 253), that he taught like themselves: *Οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς πατὴρ, οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ υἱός· ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἦν χωρὶς τοῦ λόγου· αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῇ· ἀλλ’ ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, οὐ γὰρ ἀΐδιός ἐστιν, ἀλλ’ ὕστερον ἐπιγέγονεν.* Comp. however the expressions quoted by Athanasius, p. 254, which go to prove the contrary. But the bishop of Rome insisted that Dionysius should adopt the phrase *ὁμοουσία* (Homoüsy), to which the latter at last consented, though he did not think that it was founded either upon the language of Scripture, or upon the terminology till then current in the church. An intermediate position was taken by *Zeno of Verona* (a contemporary of Origen and Cyprian), who, in Hom. i. ad Genes. in Bibl. max. PP. iii. p. 356, ss. compared the Father and the Son to two seas which are joined by straits; comp. *Dorner*, p. 754, ss. Orthodox theologians of later times, (*e. g.* Athanasius) endeavouring to do more justice to Dionysius of Alexandria, maintained that he had used the aforesaid offensive illustrations only *κατ’ οἰκονομίαν*, and that they might be easily explained from the stand he took against Sabellianism, Athanasius, p. 246, ss; see on the other side *Löffler*, Kleine Schriften, vol. i. p. 114, ss. (quoted by *Heinichen* on Euseb. vol. i. p. 306.)

§ 88.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The Theories of Sabellius, and Paul of Samosata.

Ch. Wormii historia Sabelliana. Francof. et Lips. 1696, 8. **Schleiermacher*, über den Gegensatz zwischen der sabellienischen und athanasianischen Vorstellung von der Trinität (Berlin. theol. Zeitschr. 1822, Part 3.) *Lange*, der Sabellianismus in seiner ursprünglichen Bedeutung (Illgens Zeitschr, für historische Theol. iii. 2. 3.)—*Feuerlin, J. G.*, de hæresi Pauli Samos. 1741. 4. *Ehrlich, J. G.*, de erroribus Pauli Samos. Lips. 1745. 4. *Schwab*, de Pauli Sam. vita atque doctrina. Diss. inaug. 1839.

Sabellius, a presbyter of Ptolemais, who lived about the middle of the third century, adopted the notions of the earlier Monarchians, such as Praxeas, Noëtus, and Beryllus; and maintained, in opposition to the doctrine propounded by Origen and his followers, that the appellations Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, were only so many different manifestations and names of one and the same Divine being. He thus converted the real distinction of persons (the Trinity of Essence) into a distinction of mere modes (the Trinity of manifestations.) In illustration of his views, he made use not only of various images which his opponents sometimes misinterpreted, but also of such expressions as were afterwards transferred to the terminology of the orthodox church.(1) By this means he avoided indeed, on the one hand, the subordination of the Son to the Father, and acknowledged the manifestation of the Deity in Christ as such; but, on the other, he destroyed the personality of the Son, and thus gave the appearance of Pantheism to this direct manifestation of God in Christ. For the denial of the incarnation of Christ (as distinct from God the Father) necessarily implied that of the existence of the Son as such. The opinions of *Paul of Samosata* are not, as was formerly done, to be confounded with the notions of Sabellius; they rather approached the earlier opinions of Artemon and Theodotus, which, as regards the nature of Christ, were not so much pantheistic as deistic.—The opinions of Sabellius, undoubtedly, exerted a much greater influence upon the developement of doctrines during the present period, than those of Paul of Samosata; the notions of the latter are but too intimately connected with his repulsive personal character.(2)

---

(1) Eus. vii. 6. Epiph. Hær. 62. Athan. contra Arian. iv. 2. and other passages. Basil. Ep. 210, 214, 235. Theodoret fab. hær. ii. 9. According to Epiphanius, *Sabellius* taught that there were : ἐν μιᾷ ὑποστάσει τρεῖς ἐνέργειαι (ὀνομασίαι, ὀνόματα), and illustrated his views by adducing the human trias of body, soul, and spirit, and the three qualities of the sun, viz. the enlightening (φωτιστικόν),

the warming (τὸ ϑαλπόν), and the periphery (τὸ περιφερείας σχῆμα.) But it is difficult to determine how far he applied the one or the other of these characteristics to the persons of the Trinity, and carried out the analogy in all its particulars. According to Athanasius, iv. 25, he also referred to the variety of gifts coming from the *one* Spirit, as illustrative of the Trinity. He explained the thing itself from the Divine economy; God is called Father as the creator of the world, and as legislator; he is called Son in relation to the work of redemption, and Holy Spirit as the sanctifier of man; hence the charge of the orthodox (Athan. iv. 25. Basil. ep. 210, 214. 235. Aug. tract. in Joh. § 3,) that Sabellius had adapted the doctrine of the Trinity merely to the wants of the present world (πρὸς τὰς ἑκάστοτε χρείας.) These three different modes of the Divine manifestation (according to Athanasius, iv. 13.) he regarded as a πλατύνεσϑαι, or ἐκτείνεσϑαι of it. But it is difficult to ascertain the precise distinction which he made between these different modes of manifestation and the "monas" (unity), the αὐτόϑεος whom he called υἱοπάτωρ (Athan. de syn. 16.), and the relation in which the unity stands to those modes of manifestation, and to the Father in particular. To judge from some passages quoted by Athan. iv. 25, he seems to have considered the terms πατήρ and μόνας identical, while elsewhere (iv. 13.) the Father, who is designated μόνας, forms a part of the Trinity, comp. *Dorner*, p. 706, ss. The Logos also occupies a peculiar position in the system of Sabellius. While, in his opinion, the Trinity only exists in relation to the world, the creation of the world is brought about by the Logos, to whom Sabellius, like the earlier writers, applies the predicates ἐνδιάϑετος and προφορικός, see *Dorner*, p. 711, ss. On the entire system of Sabellius, as well as on the sense in which he used the terms πρόσωπον and ὁμοούσιος, see *Schleiermacher*, l. c. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. 1. 200, ss. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. 3, p. 1019, ss. [translat. ii. p. 276, ss.] *Möhler*, Athanasius der Grosse, vol. i. p. 184, ss. As regards the historical appearance of Christ, it must be admitted, that its theological significance is not impugned by Sabellius, inasmuch as he regards the Saviour as the immediate manifestation of God. But Christ possesses personality only by his appearance in the flesh. That personality neither existed previous to his incarnation, nor does it continue to exist in heaven, since that Divine ray which had been incorporated in Christ, has returned to God. Nevertheless, Sabellius seems to have expected the second coming of Christ (*Schleiermacher*, p. 174.) According to Epiphanius, the opinions of Sabellius were principally spread in Mesopotamia, and in the vicinity of Rome. A sect of Sabellians, properly so called, did not exist.

(2) *Paul*, a native of Syria, bishop of Antioch from the year 260, was charged with heresy at several synods, and at last removed from his office (269–272.) Of his dispute with the presbyter Malchion a fragment is preserved by *Mansi*, vol. i. p. 1001, ss. Comp. the different accounts given by Epiph. 65. 1, and Euseb. vii. 27. The writers on the history of doctrines vary in their opinions respecting the relation in which he stands to either Sabellianism, or to the Unitarianism of the Artemonites. (See Euseb. v. 28, ab init.) comp. *Schleiermacher*, p. 389, 99. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. p. 204. *Augusti*, p. 59. *Meier*, Dogmengesch. p. 74, 75. *Dorner*, p. 40, supposes the difference between Sabellius and Paul of Samosata to have consisted in this, that the former thought that the whole substance of the Divine being, the latter that only one single Divine power, had manifested itself in Christ. *Trechsel* (Geschichte des Antitrinitarismus, vol. i. p. 81.) adopts the same view. At all events, we can hardly expect any serious and persevering attempts at a doctrinal system from a man whose vanity is unquestionable. Though the charge that he countenanced Jewish errors, in order to obtain favour with the Queen Zenobia, is unfounded (*Neander*, i. 3, p. 1009.) [translat. ii. p. 270.] yet it is quite probable that the vain show he made of his principles as a free-thinker was in full accordance with his ostentatious character. In later times the terms Sabellianism and Samosatianism were frequently confounded. But more generally, those who denied all distinction between the persons of the Trinity, were called Πατριπασσιανοί in the West, and Σαβελλιανοί in the East. Comp. Athanasius de Synod. 25. 7.

§ 89.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Arianism.

The system of *Arius*, a presbyter of Alexandria, forms a striking contrast with that of Sabellius. Arius, in endeavouring to define the distinction between the persons of the Trinity, carried the idea of a subordination of the one to the other, and, in the first place, of the Son to the Father, so far as to represent the former as a creation of the latter.(1) This opinion, which he sought to promulgate at Alexandria, met with the most decided opposition on the part of *Alexander*, bishop of that city.(2) This contest, which was at first merely a private dispute, gave rise to a controversy, which exerted greater influence upon the history of doctrines than all former controversies, and was the signal for an almost endless succession of subsequent conflicts.

(1) SOURCES: Arii Epist. ad Euseb. Nicomed. in Epiph. Hær. 69, § 6. Theodoret hist. eccles. i. 4. Epist. ad Alex. in Athan. de synodis Arim. et Seleuc. c. 16, and Ep. hær. 69, § 7. Of the work of Arius entitled Θαλεία, only some fragments are preserved by Athanasius.—According to his Epist. ad Euseb. his opinion was: Ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς οὐκ ἐστιν ἀγέννητος, οὐδὲ μέρος ἀγεννήτου κατ' οὐδένα τρόπον, ἀλλ' οὔτε ἐξ ὑποκειμένου τινὸς, ἀλλ' ὅτι θελήματι καὶ βουλῇ ὑπέστη πρὸ χρόνων καὶ πρὸ αἰώνων, πλήρης θεὸς, μονογενής· ἀναλλοίωτος, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῇ ἤτοι κτισθῇ ἤτοι ὁρισθῇ ἢ θεμελιωθῇ, οὐκ ἦν· ἀγέννητος γὰρ οὐκ ἦν. His views are fully settled on the last (negative) point, while he endeavours in the preceding part of the quotation to discover an expression which would give complete satisfaction. "We are persecuted," he continues, "because we say that the Son hath a beginning, while we teach that God is ἄναρχος. We say ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐστίν, because he is no part of God, nor is he created of any thing already in existence" (he rejects accordingly the theory of emanation, as well as the notion that Christ is made of subject matter.) Comp. the letter to Alex. l. c. where he defends his own doctrine against the notion of Valentinus concerning a προβολή, against that of the Manichæans concerning a μέρος, and lastly, against the opinions of Sabellius; he there uses almost the same phraseology which occurs in the letter to Eusebius. The same views are expressed in still stronger language in the fragments of the aforesaid work Thalia (in Athan. contra Arian. Orat. i. § 9.): Οὐκ ἀεὶ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ἦν, ἀλλ' ὕστερον γέγονεν· οὐκ ἀεὶ ἦν ὁ υἱὸς, οὐ γὰρ ἦν πρὶν γεννηθῇ· οὐκ ἐστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ὑπέστη καὶ αὐτός· οὐκ ἐστιν ἴδιος τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρός. Κτίσμα γάρ ἐστι καὶ ποίημα·

καὶ οὔκ ἐστιν ἀληθινὸς θεὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ μετοχῇ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐθεοποιήθη. Οὐκ οἶδε τὸν πατέρα ἀκριβῶς ὁ υἱὸς, οὔτε ὁρᾷ ὁ λόγος τὸν πατέρα τελείως· καὶ οὔτε συνιεῖ, οὔτε γινώσκει ἀκριβῶς ὁ λόγος τὸν πατέρα· οὔκ ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ μόνος αὐτὸς τοῦ πατρὸς λόγος, ἀλλ' ὀνόματι μόνον λέγεται λόγος καὶ σοφία, καὶ χάριτι λέγεται υἱὸς καὶ δύναμις· οὔκ ἐστιν ἄτρεπτος ὡς ὁ πατὴρ, ἀλλὰ τρεπτός ἐστι φύσει, ὡς τὰ κτίσματα, καὶ λείπει αὐτῷ εἰς κατάληψιν τοῦ γνῶναι τελείως τὸν πατέρα. contra Arian. i. § 5: Εἶτα θελήσας ἡμᾶς (ὁ θεὸς) δημιουργῆσαι, τότε δὲ πεποίηκεν ἕνα τινὰ καὶ ὠνόμασεν αὐτὸν λόγον καὶ σοφίαν καὶ υἱὸν ἵνα ἡμᾶς δι' αὐτοῦ δημιουργήσῃ.—He proves this from the figurative expression, Joel ii. 25. (the Septuagint reads, "the great power of God" instead of "locusts.") Comp. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 2, p. 767, ss. *Dorner*, p. 849, ss. *Baur*, Trinitätl. p. 319, ss., 342, ss.

(2) Concerning the opinion of *Alexander*, see his letter to Alexander, bishop of Constantinople, in Theodoret. hist. eccles. i. 4. and the circular letter ad Catholicos in Socrat. i. 6. *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, p. 203—206. He founds his arguments chiefly on the prologue to the Gospel of John, and shows μεταξὺ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ οὐδὲν εἶναι διάστημα. All time and all spaces of time are created by the Father through the Son. If the Son had had a beginning, the Father would have been ἄλογος. The generation of the Son had nothing in common with the sonship of believers. Christ is the Son of God κατὰ φύσιν. Comp. *Schleiermacher*, Kirchengesch. p. 212.

§ 90.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

The Doctrine of the Council of Nice.

Münscher, Untersuchung über den Sinn der nicäischen Glaubensformel, in Henkes neuem Magazin, vi. p. 334, ss. *Walch*, Bibl. symb. vet. Lemg. 1770. 8, p. 75, ss.

The Emperor Constantine the Great, and the two bishops of the name Eusebius (viz. of Cæsarea and of Nicomedia) having in vain endeavoured to bring about a reconciliation between the contending parties,(1) the *first general (œcumenical) council* was held at *Nice* (A. D. 325), principally through the intervention of the bishop Hosius of Corduba. After several other formulæ apparently favourable to Arianism(2) had been rejected, a confession of faith was adopted, in which it was established as the inviolable doctrine of the catholic church, that the Son is of the *same essence* (ὁμοούσιος) with the Father, but sustains to him the relation in which that which is begotten, stands to that which begets.(3)

(1) Comp. Epist. Constantini ad Alexandrum et Arium Eus. Vita Const. ii. 64—72, and on the attempts of the two bishops to bring about a reconciliation, see *Neander*, l. c. p. 783, ss.

(2) One of these is the confession of faith which Eusebius of Cæsarea proposed, Theodor. hist. eccles. i. 11, comp. Neander, l. c. p. 797, ss. It contained the expression: Ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, θεὸς ἐκ θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, ζωὴ ἐκ ζωῆς, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεγεννημένος. According to Athan. de decret. Syn. Nic. 20, they would at first only decide that the Son of God is εἰκὼν τοῦ πατρὸς, ὅμοιός τε καὶ ἀπαράλλακτος κατὰ πάντα τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ αὐτῷ εἶναι ἀδιαιρέτως.

(3) Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ, τουτέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαιτα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ· ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ἢ ὅτι ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτε ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ κτιστὸν ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ τρεπτὸν ἢ ἀλλοιωτὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία. Athan. epist. de decret. Syn. Nic. —Eus. Cæs. ep. ad Cæsariens.—Socrat. i. 8. Theodoret, h. e. i. 11. *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 207–9. *Baur*, Trinitätl. p. 334, ss. *Meier*, p. 146, ss. *Dorner*, p. 849.

Respecting the definitions of the phrases ἐξ οὐσίας and ὁμοούσιος comp. Athanasius, l. c. We find that even at that time a distinction was made between *sameness* and *similarity*. The Son is equal to the Father in a different sense from that in which we become like God by rendering obedience to his laws. This resemblance, moreover, is not external, accidental, like that between metal and gold, tin and silver, etc.

§ 91.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Further Fluctuations until the Synód of Constantinople.

But the phrase ὁμοούσιος did not meet with general approbation.(1) In this unsettled state of affairs the party of the Eusebians,(2) who had for some time previous enjoyed the favour of the court, succeeded in gaining its assent to a doctrine in which the use of the term ὁμοούσιος was studiously avoided, though it did not strictly inculcate the principles of Arianism. Thus Athanasius, who firmly adhered to this watchword of the Nicene party, found himself compelled to seek refuge in the West. Several synods were summoned for the purpose of settling this long protracted question, a number of formulæ were drawn up and rejected,(3) till at last the Nicene doctrine, which was equally that of Athanasius, was solemnly confirmed by the decisions of the second œcumenical synod of Constantinople (A. D. 381.)(4)

(1) Several Asiatic bishops took offence at the term in question, Socrat. i. 8, 6. *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 210. They considered it unscriptural (λέξις ἄγραφος), and were afraid lest it might give rise to a revival of the theory of emanation. But the expressions ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας was more favourable to that theory than the term ὁμοούσιος, comp. *Meier*, l. c. p. 147. Respecting the further particulars of the external events, see the works on ecclesiastical history. LEADING HISTORICAL FACTS: I. The banishment of Arius and the bishops Theonas and Secundus. The fate of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nice. II. Arius is recalled A. D. 330, after having signed the following confession of faith: εἰς Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ϑεοῦ, τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων γεγεννημένον, ϑεὸν λόγον, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο κ. τ. λ. (Socr. i. 26.) Synods of Tyre and Jerusalem, (A. D.) 335.) III. Banishment of Athanasius into Gaul. The sudden death of Arius at Constantinople (A. D. 336,) prior to his solemn

readmission into the church. Different opinions concerning this event. IV. Death of the Emperor Constantine the Great at Nicomedia (A. D. 337.) (Socr. i. 27–40.) A remarkable change had taken place in the views of Constantine towards the close of his life. The Arians were greatly supported by his son Constantius, who ascended the throne A. D. 337.

(2) Concerning this name, see *Gieseler*, i. § 82. Athanasius himself frequently calls them οἱ πεϱὶ Εὐσέβιον; by other writers they are classed together with the Arians, whom they joined in their opposition against Athanasius.

(3) I. The four confessions of faith drawn up by the Eusebians, and presented at the council of Antioch (A. D. 341), in Athan. de syn. c. 22–25. *Walch*, p. 109, (see *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 211, ss. *Gieseler*, i. § 82, note 4); in all of these the word ὁμοούσιος is wanting, but in all other points they were not favourable to Arianism. II. Formula μαϰϱόστιχος issued by the Eusebians at the second council of Antioch (A. D. 443), in which Arianism was condemned, Tritheism rejected, the doctrine of Athanasius found fault with, and, in opposition to it, the subordination of the Son to the Father was maintained. III. The synod of Sardica, (A. D. 347, or, according to others, A. D. 344)[a] Socrat. ii. 20; but the western church alone remained at Sardica, the eastern held its assemblies in the neighbouring town of Philippopolis. The Formula Philippopolitana, preserved by Hilary (de Synodis contra Arianos, § 34,) is partly a repetition of the formula μαϰϱόστιχος. IV. The confession of faith adopted at the first council of Sirmium (A. D. 351, in Athanas. § 27, in Hilary, § 37, and in Socrat. ii. 29, 30.) was directed against Photinus; see below, § 92. V. The formula of the second council of Sirmium (A. D. 357,—in Hilary, § 11, Athanas. § 28, Socrat. ii. 30.) was directed both against the use of the term ὁμοούσιος, and against speculative tendencies in general: Scire autem manifestum est solum Patrem quomodo genuerit filium suum, et filium quomodo genitus sit a patre, (comp. above Irenæus, § 42, note 9); but it also asserts the subordination of the Son to the Father in the strict Arian manner: Nulla ambiguitas est, ma-

---

[a] Respecting the chronology see *Wetzer, H. J.*, restitutio veræ Chronologiæ rerum ex controversiis Arianis inde ab anno 325 usque ad annum 350 exortarum contra chronologiam hodie receptam exhibita. Francof. 1827.

jorem esse Patrem. Nulli potest dubium esse, Patrem honore, dignitate, claritate, majestate et ipso nomine Patris majorem esse filio, ipso testante: qui me misit major me est (John xiv. 28.) Et hoc catholicum esse nemo ignorat, duas Personas esse Patris et Filii, majorem Patrem, Filium subjectum cum omnibus his, quæ ipsi Pater subjecit. VI. These strict Arian views were rejected by the Semiarians at the synod of Ancyra in Galatia (A. D. 358,) under Basil, bishop of Ancyra; the decrees of this synod are given in Epiph. hær. 73, § 2–11. (*Münscher* von Cölln and *Gieseler*, i. § 83.) VII. The confession of faith adopted at the third synod of Sirmium (A. D. 358,) in which that agreed upon at the second synod (the Arian) is condemned, and the Semiarian confession of the synod of Ancyra is confirmed. Comp. Athan. § 8. Socrat. ii. 37. VIII. Council of the western church at Ariminum (Rimini), and of the eastern at Seleucia (A. D. 359.)

(4) SYMBOLUM NICÆNO-CONSTANTINOPOLITANUM: Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων, φῶς ἐκ φωτὸς, θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ σαρκωθέντα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου, καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα· σταυρωθέντα δὲ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα καὶ ταφέντα καὶ ἀναστάντα ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς.· καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς· καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς, καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς· οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, etc. (Concerning the nature of the Holy Spirit, see below, § 93, note 7.)

Münscher edit. by von Cölln compares this symbol with the Nicene Creed, p. 240. Comp. *J. C. Suicer*, Symbolum Nicæno-Constantinopolitan. expositum et ex antiquitate ecclesiastica illustratum, Traj. ad Rhen. 1718, 4.

§ 92.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF THE CAUSES WHICH GAVE RISE TO THE AFORESAID FLUCTUATIONS.

Arianism and Semiarianism on the one hand, and return to Sabellianism on the other (Marcellus and Photinus.)

Klose, C. R. W., Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius, Kiel, 1833. *By the same*: Geschichte und Lehre des Marcellus und Photinus, Hamburg, 1837.

From the very nature of the controversy in question it followed, that the difficult task of steering clear both of Sabellianism and Arianism, devolved on those who were anxious to preserve orthodoxy in all its purity. In maintaining the sameness of essence they had to hold fast the distinction of persons; in asserting the latter they had to avoid the doctrine of subordination.(1) The Semiarians,(2) and together with them *Cyrill of Jerusalem*,(3) and *Eusebius of Cæsarea*,(4) endeavoured to abstain from the use of the term ὁμοούσιος, lest they should fall into the Sabellian error; nevertheless the former asserted, in opposition to the strict Arians (the followers of Aëtius, and the Eunomians),(5) that the Son was of *similar* essence with the Father (ὁμοιούσιος.) But *Marcellus*, bishop of Ancyra, and still more his disciple *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium, carried their opposition to Arianism so far as to adopt in substance the principles of Sabellianism. They modified it, however, to some extent, by drawing a distinct line between the terms Logos and Son of God, and thus guarded it against the very semblance of Patripassianism.(6)

---

(1) *Chrysostom* represents the necessity, as well as the difficulty of avoiding both these dangers, de sacerdotio, iv. 4, sub finem: Ἄν τε γὰρ μίαν τις εἴπῃ θεότητα, πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ παράνοιαν εὐθέως εἵλκυσε τὴν φωνὴν ὁ Σαβέλλιος· ἄν τε διέλῃ πάλιν, ἕτερον μὲν τὸν Πατέρα, ἕτερον δὲ τὸν Υἱὸν καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα δὲ τὸ ἅγιον ἕτερον εἶναι λέγων, ἐφέστηκεν Ἄρειος, εἰς

παραλλαγὴν οὐσίας ἕλκων τὴν ἐν τοῖς προσώποις διαφοράν. Δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀσεβῆ σύγχυσιν ἐκείνου, καὶ τὴν μανιώδη τούτου διαίρεσιν ἀποστρέφεσθαι καὶ φεύγειν, τὴν μὲν θεότητα Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος μίαν ὁμολογοῦντας, προστιθέντας δὲ τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις· οὕτω γὰρ ἀποτειχίσαι δυνησόμεθα τὰς ἀμφοτέρων ἐφόδους.

(2) The leaders of the Semiarians (ὁμοιουσιασταί, ἡμιάρειοι) were *Basil*, bishop of Ancyra, and *Georgius*, bishop of Laodicea. Comp. the confession of faith adopted by the synod of Ancyra, (A. D. 358), in Athanas. de Syn. § 41. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 222.

(3) *Cyrill*, Cat. xvi. 24. He rejects, generally speaking, speculations that are carried too far, and thinks it sufficient to believe: Εἷς θεὸς ὁ Πατήρ· εἷς κύριος, ὁ μονογενὴς αὐτοῦ υἱός· ἓν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὁ παράκλητος. We ought not to go beyond Scripture, nor turn either to the right or to the left, but keep in the via regia, μήτε διὰ τὸ νομίζειν τιμᾶν τὸν υἱὸν, πατέρα αὐτὸν ἀναγορεύσωμεν, μήτε διὰ τὸ τιμᾶν τὸν πατέρα νομίζειν, ἕν τι δημιουργημάτων τὸν υἱὸν ὑποπτεύσωμεν, xi. 17. Instead of ὁμοούσιος he would prefer ὅμοιος κατὰ πάντα, iv. 7, but comp. the various readings in the work of *Toutée*, p. 53, and *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 224–226. Socrat. iv. 25. He also maintains, that it is necessary to hold the right medium between Sabellianism and Arianism, iv. 8: Καὶ μήτε ἀπαλλοτριώσῃς τοῦ πατρὸς τὸν υἱὸν, μήτε συναλοιφὴν ἐργασάμενος υἱοπατορίαν πιστεύσῃς κ. τ. λ. Comp. xvi. 4, and *Meier*, die Lehre von der Trinität. i. p. 170.

(4) *Eus.* h. e. 1, 2, calls the Son τὸν τῆς μεγάλης βουλῆς ἄγγελον, τὸν τῆς ἀῤῥήτου γνώμης τοῦ πατρὸς ὑπουργὸν, τόν δεύτερον μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αἴτιον, &c. In Panegyricus, x. i. he also calls him τῶν ἀγαθῶν δεύτερον αἴτιον, an expression which greatly offended the orthodox writers;[a] and at another place he gives him the name αὐτόθεος x. 4. On the formation of compound words by means of the pronoun αὐτὸ, of which Eusebius makes frequent use, comp. the demonstr. evang. iv. 2, 13, and *Heinichen*, l. c. p. 223. In the same work, v. l. p. 215, the subordination of the Son to the Father is mentioned, though he calls him, iv. 3, p. 149, υἱὸν γεννητὸν πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων ὄντα καὶ προόντα καὶ τῷ πατρὶ ὡς υἱὸν διαπαντὸς συνόντα; on the other hand, he speaks of him as ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς ἀνεκφράστου καὶ ἀπερινοήτου βουλῆς τε καὶ δυνάμεως οὐσιούμενον. For fur-

---

[a] Comp. the note of the scholiast in the Cod. Med. (in the work of *Vales.* and *Heinichen* iii. p. 219): Κακῶς κἀνταῦθα θεολογεῖς, Εὐτέβιε, περὶ τοῦ συνανάρχου καὶ συναϊδίου καὶ συμποιητοῦ τῶν ὅλων υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, δεύτερον αὐτὸν ἀποκαλῶν αἴτιον τῶν ἀγαθῶν, συναίτιον ὄντα καὶ συνδημιουργὸν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὅλων, καὶ ὁμοούσιον, and the more recent note in the Cod. Mazarin. ibidem.

ther particulars see *Munscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 227–29, and Handbuch, iii. p. 427, ss. *Martini*, Eus. Cæs., de divinitate Christi sententia, Rost. 1795, 4. †*Ritter*, Eus. Cæs. de divinitate Christi placita, Bonn. 1823, 4. *Hænell*, de Eusebio Cæs. relig. Christ. defensore. *Meier*, l. c. i. p. 167.

(5) Concerning the strict Arians: *Aëtius* of Antioch, *Eunomius*, bishop of Cynicum, and *Acacius*, bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, comp. Philostorg. iii. iv. Epiph. hær. 76, 10. Respecting the life, writings, and opinions of Eunomius, see *Klose*, l. c. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 2, p. 852, ss. Comp. *Dorner*, i. 3, p. 853, ss. *Meier*, i. p. 176, ss.

(6) The opinions of *Marcellus* (who died about the year 374,) may be known partly from the fragments of his treatise against Asterius (de subjectione Domini, edited by *Rettberg*, under the title: Marcelliana, Gött. 1794. 8), partly from the writings of his opponents, Eusebius (κατὰ Μαρκέλλου Lib. ii. and περὶ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς θεολογίας) and Cyrill of Jerusalem (Cat. xv. 27. 33), and partly from his own letter to Julius, bishop of Rome (Epiph. hær. 72. 2.) The earlier writers are divided in their opinions concerning the orthodoxy of Marcellus: the language of Athanasius is very mild and cautious (διὰ τοῦ προσώπου μειδιάσας Epiph. hær. 72. 4); though he does not directly approve of his sentiments. Basil the Great, on the other hand, (according to Ep. 69. 2, and 263. 5,) and most of the eastern bishops, insisted upon his condemnation; most of the later writers considered him a heretic, comp. *Montfaucon*, Diatribe de causa Marcelli Ancyrani (in collect. nova Patr. Par. 1707. T. ii. pag. li.) *Klose*, p. 21–25. *Gieseler*, i. § 82, note 10. Marcellus had formerly defended the term ὁμοούσιος at the council of Nice. When he, in the course of the controversy, and of his opposition to the Arian sophist Asterius, seemed to lean more towards Sabellianism, he might do so without his own knowledge, comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. p. 277–278. Concerning the doctrine itself Marcellus returned to the old distinction made between λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and προφορικός, he imagined, on the one hand, that the λόγος was ἡσυχάζων in God, and, on the other, that it was an ἐνέργεια δραστική proceeding from him. Inasmuch as he maintains the reality of the Logos (whom he does not consider to be a mere name), in opposition to the Sabellians, and rejects the idea of a *generation* adopted by the council of Nice, because it infringes the Divinity of the Logos,) he occupies an intermediate position between

the one and the other. He also endeavoured to re-introduce the older, historical signification of the phrase υἱὸς ϑεοῦ, which was to be understood of the personal appearance of the historical Christ, and not of the pre-existence of the Logos; for the idea of generation cannot be applied to the latter. His disciple *Photinus*, bishop of Sirmium, (to whom his opponents gave the nickname Σκοτεινός,) adopted similar views, but carried them to a much greater extent; he died about the year 376. His doctrine was condemned in the aforesaid formula μακρόστιχος, and again afterwards at the council of Milan (A. D. 346.) He himself was dismissed from his office by the council of Sirmium, (A. D. 351.) The sect of the Photinians however continued to exist till the reign of Theodosius the Great. From what has been said concerning him by Athan. de Syr. § 26. Socrat. ii. 19. Epiph. hær. 70. Hilary (Fragm. and de Synodis,) Marius Mercator (Nestorii sermo iv.), and Vigil. Tapsens. (dialogus), it cannot be fully ascertained, how far Photinus either adhered to the principles of his master, or deviated from them. Comp. on this point *Münscher*, Handbuch iii. p. 447. *Neander*, ii. 2, p. 908. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, p. 279. *Gieseler*, i. § 82. *Hase*, Kirchengeschichte, p. 130. Klose, p. 66, ss. *He* too asserted the co-eternity of the Logos (but not of the Son) with the Father, and employed the term λογοπάτωρ to denote their unity, as Sabellius had used the word υἱοπάτωρ. He applied the name "Son of God," only to the incarnate Christ. The only difference between Marcellus and Photinus probably was, that the latter developed more the negative aspect of Christology than his master, and consequently considered the connection of the Logos with the historical Christ to be less intimate. Hence his followers were called Homuncionitæ, (according to Mar. Mercator quoted by *Klose*, p. 76.) But we should bear in mind: "*that theologians then but little understood the distinction made by Marcellus and Photinus between the terms* LOGOS *and* SON OF GOD. *In refuting their opponents they invariably confounded these expressions, and thus might easily draw dangerous and absurd inferences from their propositions. But at the same time it is evident that their own arguments would take a wrong direction, and thus lose the greatest part of their force.*" *Münscher*, Handbuch, l. c. Comp. however, *Dorner*, i. 3, p. 864, ss. *Baur*, Trinit. i. p. 525, ss. *Meier*, i. p. 160, ss.

§ 93.

DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The Nicene Creed had decided nothing concerning the nature of the Holy Spirit.(1) While *Lactantius* yet identified the Word with the Spirit,(2) other theologians regarded the Spirit as a mere Divine power and gift, or at least did not venture to determine his nature in any more definite way, though accustomed to teach the Divinity of the Son in unequivocal terms.(3) But *Athanasius* inferred from his premises the Divinity of the Holy Spirit,(4) and was followed by *Basil*, surnamed the Great, as well as by *Gregory of Nazianzum*, and *Gregory of Nyssa*.(5) At last the general council of Constantinople (A. D. 381), influenced by Gregory of Nazianzum, adopted more precise doctrinal definitions concerning the nature of the Holy Spirit, especially in opposition to the Macedonians (πνευματομάχους.)(6) Though the term ὁμοούσιος itself was not applied to the Spirit in the canons of this council, yet by determining that he proceeds from the Father, they prepared the way for further definitions, in which honour and power equal in every respect to those of the Father and the Son were ascribed to him.(7)

(1) It would indeed have been necessary to adopt more precise definitions; for *Arius* (according to Athan. orat. 1. § 6.), maintained that the Spirit stood in the same relation to the Son, as the Son to the Father, and that he was the first of the creatures made by the Son. But it did not appear wise to involve the matter in question still more by contending about the Divinity of the Spirit; many of the Nicene Fathers who consented that the term ὁμοούσιος should be applied to the Son, would not have so easily admitted it in reference to the Spirit. See *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 2, p. 892.

(2) See above, § 87, note 1.

(3) They had to guard against a twofold error; the one was to fall back into Sabellianism, the other to continue Arianism.

Lactantius, on the one hand, separated the Son from the Father (after the manner of the Arians), and, on the other, confounded the Spirit with the Son (as the Sabellians did.) Some writers followed his example, while others ascribed a distinct personality to the Spirit, but asserted that he was subordinate to both the Father and the Son. *Gregory of Nazianzum* gives a summary of the different views entertained in his time in the fifth of his theological orations, which was composed about the year 380 (de Spir. S. Orat. xxxi. p. 559): "Some of the wise men amongst us regard the Holy Spirit as an energy (ἐνέργεια), others think that he is a creature, some again that he is God himself, and, lastly, there are some who do not know what opinion to adopt from reverence, as they say, for the Sacred Scriptures, because *they* do not teach anything definite on this point." *Eustathius of Sebaste* belonged to this latter class; he said in reference to the Macedonian controversy (Socr. ii. 45): 'Εγὼ οὔτε θεὸν ὀνομάζειν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αἱροῦμαι οὔτε κτίσμα καλεῖν τολμήσαιμι. Comp. *Ullmann*, Gregor von Nazianz. p. 380. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 2, p. 892. *Eusebius of Cæsarea* was the more willing to subordinate the Spirit to both the Father and the Son, the more he was disposed to admit the subordination of the Son to the Father. He thinks that the Spirit is the first of all rational beings, but belongs nevertheless to the Trinity, de theol. eccles. iii. 3. 5. 6. *Hilary* was satisfied that that, which searcheth the deep things of God, must be itself divine, though he could not find any passage in Scripture in which the name "*God*" was given to the Holy Spirit, de trin. lib. xii. c. 55. (Tuum est, quicquid te init, neque alienum a te est, quicquid virtute scrutantis inest.) Comp. de trin. ii. 29: De spiritu autem sancto nec tacere oportet, nec loqui necesse est, sed sileri a nobis eorum causa, qui nesciunt, non potest. Loqui autem de eo non necesse est, quia de patre et filio auctoribus confitendum est, et quidem puto an sit, non esse tractandum. Est enim, quandoquidem donatur, accipitur, obtinetur, et qui confessioni patris et filii connexus est, non potest a confessione patris et filii separari. Imperfectum enim est nobis totum, si aliquid desit a toto. De quo si quis intelligentiæ nostræ sensum requirit, in Apostolo legimus ambo: quoniam estis, inquit, filii Dei, misit Deus spiritum filii sui in corda vestra clamantem: abba pater. Et rursum: nolite contristare Spir. S. Dei, in quo signati estis ...Unde quia est et donatur et habetur et Dei est, cesset hinc sermo calumniantium, cum dicunt per quem sit et ob quid sit, vel qualis sit. Si responsio nostra displicebit, dicentium, per quem omnia et in quo omnia sunt, et quia spiritus est Dei, donum fidelium: displiceant et apostoli et evangelistæ et prophetæ, hoc tantum de eo quod esset loquentes, et post hæc pater et filius displicebit.—He also advises us not to be perplexed by the language of Scripture, in which both the Father and the Son are sometimes called Spirit. "*He evidently confounds the terms: Deus Spiritus, Dei Spiritus, and Spiritus S., and though he believes in the separate existence of the Spirit, he does not go beyond the idea that he is a donum, a munus.*"—*Meier*, Trinitätsl. i. p. 192. *Cyrill of Jerusalem*, too, endeavours to confine himself to the use of scriptural definitions on the nature of the Holy Spirit, though he distinctly separates him from all created beings, and regards him as an essential part of the Trinity. He urges especially the practical aspect of this doctrine in opposition to the false enthusiasm of heretical fanatics, Cat. 16 and 17.[a]

(4) *Athanasius* (Ep. 4, ad Serap.) endeavoured to refute those, who declared the Holy Ghost to be a κτίσμα, or the first of the πνευμάτων λειτουργικῶν, and who were called τροπικοί πνευματομαχοῦντες. He shows that we completely renounce Arianism only when we perceive in the Trinity nothing that is foreign to the nature of God (ἀλλότριον ἢ ἐξώθεν ἐπιμιγνύμενον), but one and the same being, which is in perfect accordance with itself. Τριὰς δέ ἐστιν οὐχ ἕως ὀνόματος μόνον καὶ φαντασίας λέξεως, ἀλλὰ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ὑπάρξει τριάς (Ep. i. 28, p. 677.) He appealed both to the decisions of Holy Writ, and to the testimony of our own Christian consciousness. How could that which is not sanctified by anything else, which is itself the source of sanctification to all creatures, possess the *same* nature as those beings which are sanctified by it? We have fellowship with God, and participate in the Divine life by means of the Holy Spirit; but this could not be, if the Spirit were created by God. It is not more certain that he communicates to us the principle of Divine life, than that he himself is

---

[a] As *one* shower waters flowers of the most different species (roses and lilies), so *one* Spirit is the author of many different graces, etc. Cat. xvi. 12. He is τίμιον, τὸ ἀγαθόν, μέγας παρὰ Θεοῦ σύμμαχος καὶ προστατης, μέγας διδάσκαλος ἐκκλησίας, μέγας ὑπερασπιστὴς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, etc. ibid. c. 19. His glory far surpasses that of all angels, c. 23.

one with the Divine being (*εἰ δὲ θεοποιεῖ, οὐκ ἀμφίβολον, ὅτι ἡ τούτου φύσις θεοῦ ἐστί.*) Ep. i. ad Serap. § 24, p. 672, 73. *Neander*, l. c. p. 895. *Meier*, i. p. 187, ss.

(5) *Basil the Great* on a particular occasion composed his treatise de Spiritu Sancto, addressed to the bishop Amphilochius of Iconium, (comp. with it Ep. 189. Homilia de fide, T. ii. p. 132. Hom. contra Sab. T. ii. p. 195.) He too maintained that the name *God* should be given to the Spirit, and appealed both to Scripture in general, and to the baptismal formula in particular, in which the Spirit is mentioned together with the Father and the Son. He did not, however, lay much stress upon the name itself, but simply demanded, that the Spirit, so far from being regarded as a creature, should be considered as inseparable from both the Father and the Son. He spoke in eloquent language of the practical importance of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit (as the sanctifier of the human heart), de Spir. S. c. 16 : *Τὸ δὲ μέγιστον τεκμήριον τῆς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καὶ υἱὸν τοῦ πνεύματος συναφείας, ὅτι οὕτως ἔχειν λέγεται πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, ὡς πρὸς ἕκαστον ἔχει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν* (1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.) In answer to the objection, that the Spirit is called a *gift*, he remarks that the Son is likewise *a gift of God*, ibid. c. 24, comp. *Klose*, Basilius der Grosse, p. 34, ss. His brother, *Gregory of Nyssa*, proceeds in the second chapter of his larger catechism upon ideas similar to those of Lactantius, that the *Spirit* (breath) must be connected with the *Word*, since it is so even in the case of man. He does not, however, like Lactantius, identify the Spirit with the Word, but draws a distinction between them. The Spirit is not to be considered as anything foreign which enters from without into the Deity (comp. Athanasius ;) to think of the Spirit of God as similar to ours, would be detracting from the glory of the Divine omnipotence. "On the contrary, we imagine that this *essential power which manifests itself as a separate hypostasis*, can neither be separated from the Godhead in which it rests, nor from the Divine Word which it follows. Nor does it cease to exist, but being self-existing (*αὐτοκίνητον*) like the Deity, it is ever capable of choosing the good, and of carrying out all its resolutions." Comp. *Rupp*, Gregor. von Nyssa, p. 169, 70. The views of *Gregory of Nazianzum* agreed with those of the two writers already named, though he clearly perceived the difficulties with which the doctrine in question was beset in his time. He was prepared to meet the objection, that it would introduce a *θεὸν ξένον καὶ ἄγραφον* (Orat.

xxx. 1. p. 556. *Ullmann*, p. 381); he also acknowledged that it was not expressly taught in Scripture, and therefore thought that it was quite justifiable to go beyond the letter itself. He has recourse to the idea of a gradual revelation, which, as he imagines, stands in connection with a natural developement of the Trinity. "The Old Test. sets forth the Father in a clear, but the Son in a somewhat dim light: the New Test. reveals the Son, but it only intimates the Divinity of the Spirit; but now the Spirit dwells in our midst, and manifests himself more distinctly. It was not desirable that the Divinity of the Son should be proclaimed, as long as that of the Father was not fully recognized; nor did it appear advisable to add that of the Spirit, as long as that of the Son was not believed." Gregory numbered the doctrine of the Holy Spirit among those things of which Christ speaks, John xvi. 12, and recommended therefore some degree of prudence in discourses on this dogma. He himself developed it principally in his controversy with Macedonius, and refuted him by proving that the Holy Spirit is neither a mere power, nor a creature, and accordingly, that he is God himself. For further particulars see *Ullmann*, p. 378, ss.

(6) The word Πνευματομάχοι has a general meaning, and comprehends of course the strict Arians. But the Divinity of the Spirit was equally denied by the *Semiarians*, whose views concerning the nature of the Son resembled those of the orthodox party; the most prominent theologian among them was *Macedonius*, bishop of Constantinople (A. D. 341–360.) Soz. iv. 27. says of him: Εἰσηγεῖτο δὲ τὸν υἱὸν θεὸν εἶναι, κατὰ πάντα τε καὶ κατ' οὐσίαν ὅμοιον τῷ πατρί· τό τε ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἄμοιρον τῶν αὐτῶν πρεσβείων ἀπεφαίνετο, διάκονον καὶ ὑπηρέτην καλῶν. Theodoret, ii. 6, adds, that he did not hesitate to call the Spirit a creature. His opinion was afterwards called the *Marathonian*, from *Marathonius*, bishop of Nicomedia. His followers appear to have been very numerous, especially in the vicinity of Lampsacus, see *Meier*, i. p. 192. The Macedonians, though condemned at the second Œcumenical council, continued to exist as a separate sect in Phrygia down to the fifth century, when they were combated by Nestorius. The objections which the Macedonians either made themselves to the Divinity of the Spirit, or with which they were charged by their opponents, are the following: "The Holy Spirit is either begotten or not begotten; if the latter, we have two unoriginated beings (δύο τὰ ἄναρχα), viz. the Father

and the Spirit; if begotten, he must be begotten either of the Father or of the Son: if of the Father, it follows that there are two Sons in the Trinity, and hence brothers, (the question then arises, who is the elder of the two, or are they twins?) but if of the Son, we have a grandson of God (ϑεὸς υἱωνός) etc. Greg. Orat. xxxi. 7, p. 560, comp. Athanas. Ep. i. ad Serapion, c. 15. In opposition to this *Gregory* simply remarks, that not the idea of generation, but that of ἐκπόρευσις is to be applied to the Spirit according to John xv. 26, and that the procession of the Spirit is quite as incomprehensible as the generation of the Son. To these objections was allied another, viz. that the Spirit is not a perfect being, if he is not (a) Son. But the Macedonians chiefly appealed to the absence of decisive Scriptures. Comp. *Ullmann*, p. 390, 91.

(7) Τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιὸν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον, καὶ συνδοξαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφῆτων. Comp. § 91, note 4.

§ 94.

PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Walch, J. G., historia controversiæ Græcorum Latinorumque de processione Spir. S. Jenæ, 1751. 8. *Pfaff, Chr. Matth.*, historia succincta controversiæ de Processione Spir. S. Tüb. 1749. 4.

The canons of the council of Constantinople, however, had not fully settled the point in question. The relation of the Spirit to the Trinity in general had been determined, but the particular relation in which he stands to the Son and the Father separately, remained yet to be decided. Inasmuch as the formula declared, that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, without making any distinct mention of the Son, room was left for doubt, whether it denied the procession of the Spirit from the latter, or not. On the one hand, the assertion that the Spirit proceeds *only* from the Father, and not from the Son, seemed to favour the notion, that the Son is subordinate to the Father; on the other, to maintain that he proceeds from both the Father and the Son, would be placing the Spirit in a still greater dependence (viz. on two persons instead of one.) Thus the desire fully to establish the Divinity of the Son, would easily detract from the Divine nature of the Spirit; the wish, on the contrary, to prove the self-existence and independence of the Spirit, would tend to throw the importance of the Son into the shade. The Greek Fathers, *Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa,* and others, asserted the procession of the Spirit from the Father, without distinctly denying that he also proceeds from the Son.(1) *Epiphanius,* on the other hand, ascribed the origin of the Spirit to both the Father and the Son, with whom *Marcellus of Ancyra* agreed.(2) But *Theodore of Mopsuestia* and *Theodoret* would not in any way admit that the Spirit proceeds from the Son,(3) and defended their opinion in opposition to *Cyril of Alexandria.*(4) The Latin Fathers, on the contrary, and *Augustine* in particular,(5) taught the procession of the Spirit from both the Father and the Son. This doctrine was so firmly established in the West, that at the third synod of Toledo (A. D. 589.) the clause *filioque* was added to the confession of faith adopted by the council of Constantinople, which afterwards led to the disruption between the eastern and western churches.(6)

(1) In accordance with the prevailing notions of the age, the Father was considered as the only effectual principle (μία ἀρχή), to whom all other things owe their existence, of whom the Son is begotten, and from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds, who performs all things *through* the Son, and *in* the Holy Spirit. The phrase: that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, was maintained especially against the *Pneumatomachi.* It was asserted, in opposition to them, "*that the Holy Spirit does not derive his existence from the Son in a dependent manner, but that he stands in a direct relation to the Father, as to the common first cause; that the Holy Spirit proceeds in the same manner from the Father, as the Son is begotten of the Father.*" *Neander,* Kirchengeschichte, ii. p. 897.

(2) *Epiphan.* Ancor. § 9., after having proved the Divinity of the Spirit, *e. g.* from Acts v. 3, says: ἄρα θεὸς ἐκ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα, without expressly stating that he ἐκπορεύεται ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ. Comp. Ancor. 8: Πνεῦμα γὰρ Θεοῦ καὶ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ πνεῦμα υἱοῦ, οὐ κατά τινα σύνθεσιν, καθάπερ ἐν ἡμῖν ψυχὴ καί σῶμα, ἀλλ' ἐν μέσῳ πατρὸς καί υἱοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ, τρίτον τῇ ὀνομασίᾳ. *Marcellus* inferred from the supposition, that the Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son, the sameness of the last two in the Sabellian sense. Eus. de eccles. theol. iii. 4, p. 168, (quoted by *Klose,* über Marcell. p. 47.) Concerning the views of *Photinus*, see *Klose*, l. c. p. 83.

(3) *Theodore* of Mopsuestia in his confession of faith (quoted by *Walch,* Bibl. Symb. p. 204.) combated that opinion which would represent the Spirit as διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τὴν ὕπαρξιν εἰληφός. On the opinion of *Theodoret* comp. the ix. anathema of Cyrill, Opp. v. p. 47.

(4) *Cyrill* condemned all who denied that the Holy Spirit was the proprium of Christ. *Theodoret* in reply, observed, that this expression was not objectionable, if nothing more were understood by it, than that the Holy Spirit is of the same essence (ὁμοούσιος) with the Son, and proceeds from the Father; but that it ought to be rejected if it were meant to imply, that he derives his existence from the Son, or through the Son, either of which would be contrary to what is said, John xv. 26; 1 Cor. ii. 12. Comp. *Neander*, l. c. p. 900.

(5) Augustine, tract. 99, in evang. Joh.: A quo autem habet filius, ut sit Deus (est enim de Deo Deus), ab illo habet utique ut etiam de illo procedat Spir. S. Et per hoc Spir. S. ut etiam de filio procedat, sicut procedit de patre, ab ipso habet patre. Ibid.: Spir. S. non de patre procedit in filium et de filio procedit ad sanctificandam creaturam, sed simul de utroque procedit, quamvis hoc filio Pater dederit, ut quemadmodum de se, ita de illo quoque procedat. De trin. 4. 20: Nec possumus dicere, quod Spir. S. et a filio non procedat, neque frustra idem Spir. et Patris et Filii Spir. dicitur.

(6) This additional clause made its appearance at the time when Rekkared, king of the Visigoths, passed over from the Arian to the catholic church. The above synod pronounced an anathema against all who did not believe that the Spirit proceeded from both the Father and the Son. Comp. *Neander,* l. c. p. 901.

§ 95.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY CONCLUDED.

The more accurately the Divinity both of the Holy Spirit, and of the Son was defined, the more important it became, *first,* exactly to determine the relation in which the different persons stand to the Godhead in general, and to each other in particular, and, *secondly,* to settle the ecclesiastical terminology. *Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum,* and *Gregory of Nyssa* in the Greek, *Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine,* and *Leo the Great* in the Latin church, exerted the greatest influence upon the formation of the said terminology. According to it the word οὐσία (essentia, substantia) denotes what is common to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the abstract; the word ὑπόστασις (persona) signifies the individual, concrete.(1) Each person possesses some peculiarity (ἰδιότης), by which it is distinguished from the other persons, notwithstanding the existing sameness of essence. Thus underived existence (ἀγεννησία) belongs to the Father, generation (γέννησις) to the Son, and procession (ἐκπόρευσις, ἔκπεμψις) to the Holy Spirit.(2) Since *Augustine* rejected all the distinctions which had been formerly made between the different persons, and referred to the one God that which had been predicated before his time of the separate persons, he could not entirely avoid the appearance of Sabellianism.(3) *Boëthius* and others adopted his views on this point.(4)

---

(1) The writers of this period avoided the use of the term πρόσωπον, which would have corresponded more exactly to the Latin word "persona," while ὑπόστασις means literally substantia, lest it might lead to Sabellianism; but they sometimes confounded ὑπόστασις with οὐσία, and occasionally used φύσις instead of the latter. This was done *e. g.* by *Gregory* of Nazianzum, Orat. xxiii. 11, p. 431. xxxiii. 16, p. 614. xiii. 11, p. 431. Ep. 1,

ad Cledonium p. 739. ed. Lips. quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 355, note 1, and p. 356, note 1. Gregory also sometimes attaches the same meaning to ὑπόστασις and to πρόσωπον, though he prefers the use of the latter, Orat. xx. 6, p. 379. *Ullmann*, p. 356, note 3. This distinction is most accurately defined by *Basil*, Ep. 236. 6. (quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 242, 243.): Οὐσία δὲ καὶ ὑπόστασις ταύτην ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν, ἣν ἔχει τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον. οἷον ὡς ἔχει τὸ ζῶον πρὸς τὸν δεῖνα ἄνθρωπον. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐσίαν μὲν μίαν ἐπὶ τῆς θεότητος ὁμολογοῦμεν, ὥστε τὸν τοῦ εἶναι λόγον μὴ διαφόρως ἀποδιδόναι. ὑπόστασιν δὲ ἰδιάζουσαν, ἵν' ἀσύγχυτος ἡμῖν καὶ τετρανωμένη ἡ περὶ Πατρὸς παὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἔννοια ἐνυπάρχῃ κ. τ. λ. Comp. Greg. Naz. Orat. xxix. 11, p. 530. *Ullmann*, p. 355, note 3, and Orat. xlii. 16, p. 759, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 356, note 3, where the distinction between οὐσία and ὑπόστασις is prominently brought forward.

(2) Greg. Naz. Orat. xli. 9: Πάντα ὅσα ὁ πατὴρ, τοῦ υἱοῦ, πλὴν τῆς ἀγεννησίας· πάντα ὅσα ὁ υἱὸς, τοῦ πνεύματος, πλὴν τῆς γεννήσεως κ. τ. λ. Orat. xxv. 16: Ἴδιον δὲ πατρὸς μὲν ἡ ἀγεννησία, υἱοῦ δὲ ἡ γέννησις, πνεύματος δὲ ἡ ἔκπεμψις, but the terms ἰδιότης and ὑπόστασις were sometimes used synonymously, *e. g.* Greg. Naz. Orat. xxxiii. 16, p. 614. *Ullmann*, p. 357.

(3) *Augustinus* contra serm. Arian. c. 2, no. 4, (Opp. T. viii.): Unus quippe Deus et ipsa trinitas et sic unus Deus, quomodo unus creator. He referred the appearances of the Deity, which were formerly ascribed to the Logos alone, to the whole Trinity. In support of his view, he appeals to the three men who appeared to Abraham, de trin. ii. 18. He also thinks that the mission of the Son is not only a work of the Father, but of the whole Trinity. The Father alone is not sent, because he is unbegotten (comp. the passages quoted by *Meier*, i. p. 206, ss.) The distinctions between the persons are, in his opinion, not distinctions of *nature*, but of *relation*. But he is aware that we have no appropriate language to denote those distinctions, de trinit. v. 10: Quum quæritur, quid tres, magna prorsus inopia humanum laborat eloquium. Dictum est tamen: tres personæ, non ut illud diceretur, sed re taceretur. The persons are not to be regarded as species, for we do not say, tres equi are unum animal, but tria animalia. He brings his views concerning the Trinity into connection with anthropology, but by comparing the three persons with the memoria, intellectus, and voluntas of man (l. c. ix. 11; x. 10. 18; xv. 7,) he evidently borders upon Sabellianism, and would lead us to suppose that he believed in

mere modes of manifestation, instead of persons. On the other hand, he directs our attention to the practico-religious importance of the doctrine of the Trinity, by reminding us of the true nature of love without envy, de trin. ix. 2: Cum aliquid amo, tria sunt; ego et quod amo et ipse amor. Non enim amo amorem, nisi amantem amem: nam non est amor, ubi nihil amatur. Tria ergo sunt: amans et quod amatur et (mutuus) amor. Quid si non amem nisi meipsum, nonne duo erant, quod amo et amor? Amans enim et quod amatur, hoc idem est, quando se ipse amat. Sicut amare et amari, eodem modo id ipsum est, cum se quisque amat. Eadem quippe res bis dicitur, cum dicitur: amat se et amatur a se. Tunc enim non est aliud atque aliud amare et amari, sicut non est alius atque alius amans et amatus. At vero amor et quod amatur etiam sic duo sunt. Non enim cum quisque se amat, amor est, nisi cum amatur ipse amor. Aliud est autem amare se, aliud est amare amorem suum. Non enim amatur amor, nisi jam aliquid amans, quia ubi nihil amatur, nullus est amor. Duo ergo sunt, cum se quisque amat, amor et quod amatur. Tunc enim amans et quod amatur unum est... Amans quippe ad amorem refertur et amor ad amantem. Amans enim aliquo amore amat, et amor alicujus amantis est...Retracto amante nullus est amor, et retracto amore nullus est amans. Ideoque quantum ad invicem referuntur, duo sunt. Quod autem ad se ipsa dicuntur, et singula spiritus, et simul utrumque unus spiritus, et singula mens et simul utrumque una mens. Cf. lib. xv.

(4) *Boëthius*, de trin. (ad Symmach.) c. 2: Nulla igitur in eo (Deo) diversitas, nulla ex diversitate pluralitas, nulla ex accidentibus multitudo, atque idcirco nec numerus. Cap. 3: Deus vero a Deo nullo differt, ne vel accidentibus, vel substantialibus differentiis in subjecto positis distat; ubi vero nulla est differentia, nulla est omnino pluralitas; quare nec numerus; igitur unitas tantum. Nam quod tertio repetitur, Deus; quum Pater et Filius et Spir. S. nuncupatur, tres unitates non faciunt pluralitatem numeri in eo quod ipsæ sunt...Non igitur si de Patre et Filia et Spir. S. tertio prædicatur Deus, idcirco trina prædicatio numerum facit...Cap. 6: Facta quidem est trinitatis numerositas in eo quod est *prædicatio relationis;* servata vero unitas in eo quod est indifferentia vel substantiæ vel operationis vel omnino ejus, quæ secundum se dicitur, prædicationis. Ita igitur substantia continet unitatem, relatio multiplicat trinitatem, atque ideo sola sigillatim proferuntur atque separatim quæ relationis sunt;

nam idem Pater qui Filius non est, nec idem uterque qui Spir. S. Idem tamen Deus est, Pater et Filius et Spir. S., idem justus, idem bonus, idem magnus, idem omnia, quæ secundum se poterunt prædicari. Boëthius falls into gross Sabellian errors, by drawing an illustration from the pantheistic use of these terms: gladius, mucro, ensis, to denote one and the same thing, see *Baur,* Dreieinigkeitsl. ii. p. 34. The orthodox doctrine of the western church is expressed in very concise formulas by *Leo the Great, e. g.* sermo LXXV. 3: Non alia sunt Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti, sed omnia quæcunque habet Pater, habet et Filius, habet et Spiritus S.; nec unquam in illa trinitate non fuit ista communio, quia hoc est ibi omnia habere, quod semper existere, LXXV. 1, 2: Sempiternum est Patri, coæterni sibi Filii esse genitorem. Sempiternum est Filio, intemporaliter a Patre esse progenitum. Sempiternum quoque est Spiritui Sancto Spiritum esse Patris et Filii: ut nunquam Pater sine Filio, nunquam Filius sine Patre, nunquam Pater *et Filius* fuerint sine Spiritu Sancto, et omnibus existentiæ gradibus exclusis, nulla ibi persona sit anterior, nulla posterior. Hujus enim beatæ trinitatis incommutabilis deitas una est in substantia, indivisa in opere, concors in voluntate, par in potentia, æqualis in gloria. Other passages are quoted by *Perthel,* Leo der Grosse, p. 138, ss.

§ 96.

TRITHEISM, TETRATHEISM.

In keeping the three persons in the Godhead distinctly separate, much caution was needed, lest the idea of οὐσία, which refers to a unity, should be taken as a generic term, and made to embrace the ὑπόστασις as the species. This would necessarily have given rise to the notion of three Gods. But that error had also to be guarded against, by which God as such (αὐτόθεος) was distinguished from, and represented as superior to, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. In the latter case there would have been the appearance of four persons, or even four gods. *Tritheites,*(1) and *Tetratheites,*(2) indeed, are found in the catalogue of heretical teachers, though many of the charges brought forward against them are founded on false inferences.

(1) To the Tritheites belonged *John Coscusnages* of Constantinople, and *John Philoponus* of Alexandria. The former, when examined by the Emperor Justinian concerning his faith, is said to have acknowledged *one* nature of the incarnate Christ, but asserted three natures and deities in the Trinity. The Tritheites *Conon* and *Eugenius* are said to have made the same assertions. The opinion of Philoponus can be seen from a fragment, (Διαιτητής) preserved by John Damascenus (de hæresib. c. 83, p. 101, ss. Phot. bibl. cod. 75. Niceph. xviii. 45–48, extracts from which are quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. 251.) In his view the φύσις is the genus which comprehends species of the same nature. The term being and nature are identical, the term ὑπόστασις, or person, denotes the separate real existence of nature, that which the philosophers of the peripatetic school call ἄτομον, because there the distinction between genus and species ceases to exist. Comp. *Scharfenberg, J. G.*, de Jo. Philopono, Tritheismi defensore, Lips. 1768, (Comm. th. ed. Velthusen, etc. T. i.) and *Trechsel*, in the Studien und Kritiken 1835, part 1, p. 95, ss. *Meier*, l. c. i. p. 195, ss.

(2) The leader of the Tetratheites was *Damianus*, the Monophysite (Severian) patriarch of Constantinople. In his controversy with *Peter of Callinico*, patriarch of Antioch, he maintained that the Father is another, the Son another, and the Holy Ghost another, but that none of them is God as such; they possess the Divine nature only in common, and each is God in so far as he participates in it. They were also called Damianites or Angelites (from the city of Angelium.) Comp. Niceph. xiii. 49. *Schröckh*, xviii. p. 624. *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 253. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. p. 364. *Meier*, i. p. 198.

§ 97.

SYMBOLUM QUICUNQUE.

J. G. Vossius, de tribus Symbolis, Amstel. 1642. Diss. ii. *Waterland, Dan.* Critical history of the Athanasian Creed, Cambridge, 1724. 28. 8. *Dennis, John* the Athanasian Creed, 1815. Comp. *Münscher, ed. by von Cölln*, i. p. 249, 50. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, i. 12. 4. 231. ii. 124.

The doctrine of the church concerning the Trinity appears most fully developed, and expressed in its most perfect symbolical form in what is called the *Symbolum quicunque* (commonly, but erroneously called the Creed of St. Athanasius.) It originated in the school of Augustine, and is ascribed by some to Vigilius Tapsensis, by others to Vincentius Lerinensis, and by some again to others.(1) By the repetition of positive and negative propositions, the mysterious doctrine is presented to the understanding in so hieroglyphical a form, as to make man feel his own weakness. The consequence was, that all further endeavours of human ingenuity to solve its apparent contradictions by philosophical arguments, must dash against this bulwark of faith, on which salvation was made to depend, as the waves against an impregnable rock.(2)

---

(1) According to the old account, Athanasius drew up the creed in question at the Synod of Rome in the year 341. This, however, appears improbable, *first*, because it exists only in the Latin language; *secondly*, from the absence of the term *consubstantialis* (ὁμοούσιος); and, *thirdly*, from the more fully developed doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit (the procession from the Father and the Son.) It was not generally adopted until the seventh century, when it was classed together as an *Œcumenical* symbol with the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed. *Paschasius Quesnel* (dissert. xiv. in Leonis M. Opp. p. 386, ss.) first pronounced it as his opinion that it was composed by Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus in Africa, who lived towards the close of the fifth century. *Muratori* (Anecd. lat. T. ii. p. 212–217), ascribed its authorship to Venantius Fortunatus (a Gallican bishop in the sixth century), and *Waterland* to Hilary of Arles (who lived about the middle of the fifth century.)

(2) SYMBOLUM ATHANASIANUM :

1. Quicumque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus habet, ut teneat catholicam fidem. 2. Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit. 3. Fides autem catholica hæc est, ut unum Deum in Trinitate et Trinitatem in unitate veneremur. 4. Neque confundentes personas,

neque substantiam separantes. 5. Alia enim est persona Patris, alia Filii, alia Spiritus Sancti. 6. Sed Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti una est divinitas, æqualis gloria, æqualis majestas. 7. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spir. S. 8. Increatus Pater, increatus Filius, increatus Spir. S. 9. Immensus Pater, immensus Filius, immensus Spiritus S. 10. Æternus Pater, æternus Filius, æternus et Spir. S. 11. Et tamen non tres æterni, sed unus æternus. 12. Sicut non tres increati, nec tres immensi, sed unus increatus et unus immensus. 13. Similiter omnipotens Pater, omnipotens Filius, omnipotens et Spiritus S. 14. Et tamen non tres omnipotentes, sed unus omnipotens. 15. Ita deus Pater, deus Filius, deus et Spir. S. 16. Et tamen non tres dii sunt, sed unus est Deus. 17. Ita dominus Pater, dominus Filius, dominus et Spir. S. 18. Et tamen non tres domini, sed unus dominus. 19. Quia sicut sigillatim unamquamque personam et Deum et dominum confiteri christiana veritate compellimur, ita tres Deos aut dominos dicere catholica religione prohibemur. 20. Pater a nullo est factus, nec creatus, nec genitus. 21. Filius a Patre solo est, non factus, non creatus, sed genitus. 22. Spir. S. a Patre et Filio non creatus, nec genitus, sed procedens. 23. Unus ergo Pater, nec tres patres; unus Filius, non tres filii; unus Spiritus S., non tres spiritus sancti. 24. Et in hac Trinitate nihil prius aut posterius, nihil majus aut minus, sed totæ tres personæ coæternæ sibi sunt et coæquales. 25. Ita ut per omnia, sicut jam supra dictum est, et unitas in Trinitate et Trinitas in unitate veneranda sit. 26. Qui vult ergo salvus esse, ita de Trinitate sentiat. (Opp. Athanasii, T. iii. p. 719.—*Walch*, Bibl. Symb. vet. p. 136, ss., it is also contained in the collections of the symbolical books published by *Tittman*, *Hase*, and others.[a])

---

[a] While salvation thus appears to be made dependent on the most refined philosophical definitions, it is pleasing to hear other men, such as *Gregory of Nazianzum* (see *Ullmann*, p. 159, 170. *Neander*, Chrysost. ii. 19.) raising their voices during this period, who did not attach such unqualified value to the mere orthodoxy of the understanding, and who were fully convinced of the limits of human knowledge and the insufficiency of such dogmatic definitions, Greg. Orat. xxxi. 33, p. 577. *Ullmann*, p. 336, comp., however, p. 334, 35. *Rufinus* also says, expos. p. 18: Quomodo autem Deus pater genuerit filium, nole discutias, nec te curiosius ingeras in profundi hujus arcanum (al. profundo hujus arcani,) ne forte dum inaccessæ lucis fulgorem pertinacius perscrutaris, exiguum ipsum, qui mortalibus divino munere con-

b. CHRISTOLOGY.

§ 98.

THE TRUE HUMANITY OF CHRIST.

Traces of Docetism.—Arianism.

It was no less difficult to determine the relation of the Divine to the human nature of Christ than to define the relation which exists between the three persons of the Trinity and the One God. For the more decidedly the church asserted the Divinity of the Son of God, the more the doctrine of the incarnation of the Logos had to be guarded against erroneous notions either concerning the true Divinity, or respecting the true humanity of Christ. In opposition to Docetism, the doctrine of the human nature of Christ had indeed been so firmly established, that no one was likely to deny that he possessed a human body, though *Hilary*, who was orthodox in all other points, bordered upon Docetism, by maintaining that the body of Jesus could not undergo any real sufferings.(1) But two other questions arose, which were beset with still greater difficulties. In the first place, it was asked, whether a human soul formed a necessary part of the humanity of Christ;—and if so (as the orthodox maintained in opposition to the Arians),(2) it was still doubtful whether this soul was to be understood only as the animal soul, or as both the animal soul and the rational spirit of man (in distinction from the Spirit of God.)

(1) *Hilary* wishes to preserve the most intimate union between

---

cessus est, perdas aspectum. Aut si putas in hoc omni indagationis genere nitendum, prius tibi propone quæ nostra sunt: quæ si consequenter valueris expedire, tunc a terrestribus ad cœlestia et a visibilibus ad invisibilia properato.

the Divine and human natures of Christ, so that it may be said: totus hominis Filius est Dei Filius, and vice versa; for the same reason he says concerning the Godman, de trin. x. 23: Habens ad patiendum quidem corpus et passus est, sed non habuit naturam ad dolendum. (He compares it to an arrow which passes through the water without wounding it.)—Comment. in Ps. cxxxviii. 3: Suscepit ergo infirmitates, quia homo nascitur; et putatur dolere, quia patitur: caret vero doloribus ipse, quia Deus est, (the usage of the Latin word *pati* allowed such a distinction to be made.)—De trin. xi. 48: In forma Dei manens servi formam assumsit, non demutatus, sed se ipsum exinaniens et intra se latens et intra suam ipse vacuefactus potestatem; dum se usque ad formam temperat habitus humani, ne potentem immensamque naturam assumptæ humanitatis non ferret infirmitas, sed in tantum se virtus inconscripta moderaretur, in quantum oporteret eam usque ad patientiam connexi sibi corporis obedire. He opposes the purely docetic interpretation of the Impassibilitas, de synodis 49: Pati potuit, et passibile esse non potuit quia passibilitas naturæ infirmis significatio est, passio autem est eorum, quæ sunt illata perpessio. He makes a distinction between passionis materia et passibilitatis infirmitas. Hilary, however, ascribes a human soul to Christ, but he received neither that soul, nor his body from Mary; on the contrary, he owes his origin to himself: comp. *Dorner*, p. 1040, ss.

(2) *Athan.* contra Apollin. ii. 3: Ἄρειος δὲ σάρκα μόνην πρὸς ἀποκρυφὴν τῆς θεότητος ὁμολογεῖ, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ ἔσωθεν ἐν ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπου, τουτέστι τῆς ψυχῆς, τὸν Λόγον ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ λέγει γεγονέναι, τὴν τοῦ πάθους νόησιν καὶ τὴν ἐξ ᾅδου ἀνάστασιν τῇ θεότητι προσάγειν τολμῶν. Comp. Epiph. Hær. 69. 19. and other passages quoted by *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 268. This notion was very prominently brought forward by the Arians, *Eudoxius* and *Eunomius;* respecting the former see *Cave,* Historia Script. eccles. i. p. 219; concerning the latter, comp. *Mansi,* Conc. T. iii. p. 648. Another party of the Arians, however, rejected the notion that the Logos had been changed into the soul of Christ, and supposed a human soul along with the Logos. Comp. *Dorner*, ii. 2, p. 1038. But even some orthodox theologians of this period used indefinite language on this point previous to the rise of the Apollinarian controversy. Comp. *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 269. *Dorner*, l. c. p. 1071, ss.

§ 99.

THE DOCTRINE OF APOLLINARIS.

Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea, who, generally speaking, enjoyed a high reputation among orthodox theologians, imagined that that higher life of reason which elevates man above the rest of creation, could be of no use to him, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, or rather, that its place was wholly supplied by the Logos.(1) His intention seems to have been not so much to detract from the dignity of Christ, as to honour him. He was opposed by *Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzum,* and *Gregory of Nyssa,* to whose exertions it must be attributed, that the catholic church adopted the doctrine, that Christ possessed a perfect human nature consisting of a body, and of a rational soul, together with his Divine nature.(2) The council of Constantinople (A. D. 381.) condemned Apollinarianism as heretical.

---

(1) *Apollinaris* was led by his philosophical turn of mind to suppose, that he might establish his argument with mathematical precision (*γεωμετρικαῖς ἀποδείξεσι καὶ ἀνάγκαις.*) Of the writings in which he explained his views, only fragments are extant in the works of Gregory of Nyssa, Theodoret, and Leontius Byzantinus (who lived about the year 590); they were the following: *περὶ σαρκώσεως λογίδιον (ἀπόδειξις περὶ τῆς θείας ἐνσαρκώσεως)—τὸ κατὰ κεφάλαιον βιβλίον—περὶ ἀναστάσεως—περὶ πίστεως λογίδιον*—and some letters (in *Gallandii* Bibl. PP. T. xii. p. 706, ss. *Angelo Mai* Class. auct. T. ix. p. 495, ss.) Apollinaris objected to the union of the Logos with a rational soul, that the human being thus united to the Logos, must either preserve his own free will, in which case there would be no true union of the Divine and the human, or that the human soul had lost its proper liberty by becoming united to the Logos, either of which would be absurd. "He chiefly opposed the *τρεπτόν*, or the *liberty of choice in christology.*"—*Dorner*, l. c. p. 987. In his opinion Christ is not only *ἄνθρωπος ἔνθεος*, but the incarnate God. According to the threefold division of man, Apollinaris was willing to ascribe a soul to

the Redeemer, in so far as he thought it to be a mean between body and spirit. But that which itself determines the soul (τὸ αὐτοκίνητον), and constitutes the higher dignity of man, the νοῦς (the ψυχὴ λογικὴ) of Christ, could not be of human origin, but must be purely Divine; for his incarnation did not consist in the Logos becoming νοῦς, but in becoming σάρξ. But the Divine reason supplying the place of the human, there exists a specific difference between Christ and other beings. In their case everything had to undergo a process of gradual developement, which cannot be brought about without either conflicts or sin, (ὅπου γὰρ τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, ἐκεῖ καί ἁμαρτία, apud. Athan. i. 2, p. 923. Comp. c. 21, p. 939: ἁμαρτία ἐνυπόστατος.) But this could not take place in the case of Christ: οὐδεμία ἄσκησις ἐν Χριστῷ· οὐκ ἄρα νοῦς ἐστιν ἀνθρώπινος. Comp. Gregory of Nyssa, Antirrhet. adv. Apollin. iv. c. 221. At the same time Apollinaris supposed the body and soul of Christ to be so completely filled with the higher and Divine principle of spiritual life, that he did not hesitate to use expressions such as: "God died, God is born," etc. He even maintained that on account of this intimate union Divine homage is also due to the human nature of Christ, l. c. p. 241, 264. His opponents therefore charged him with Patripassianism. But we do not think that Apollinaris ever asserted, as Gregory of Nazianzum would have us believe, that Christ must have possessed an irrational, animal soul, *e. g.* that of a horse, or an ox, because he had not a rational human soul: Gregory himself seems to have drawn such inferences from the premises of Apollinaris. On the other hand, he accused his opponents in a similar manner of believing in two Christs, two Sons of God, etc. Comp. *Dorner,* p. 985, ss. *Ullmann,* Greg. v. Naz. p. 401, ss. *Baur,* Gesch. der Trinitätl. i. p. 585, ss.

(2) *Athanasius* maintained, in opposition to Apollinaris, contra Apollinar. libri ii. (but without mentioning his opponent by name, as he enjoyed personal intercourse with him), that it behoved Christ to be our example in every respect, and that his nature therefore must resemble ours. Sinfulness, which is empirically connected with the developement of man, is not a necessary attribute of human nature, as the Manichæan notions would lead us to suppose. Man, on the contrary, was originally free from sin, and Christ appeared on that very account, viz. in order to show that God is not the author of sin, and to prove that it is possible to live a sinless life (the controversy thus touched up-

on questions of an anthropological nature.)—Athanasius distinctly separated the Divine from the human (comp. especially lib. ii.), but he did not admit that he taught the existence of two Christs. Comp. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 2, p. 923. *Möhler*, Athanasius, ii. p. 262, ss. (his attacks upon the doctrine of Luther are out of place.)[a] *Gregory of Nazianzum*, (Ep. ad Cledon. et orat. 51.) equally asserted the necessity of a true and perfect human nature. It was not only necessary, as the medium by which God manifested himself; but Jesus could redeem and sanctify man only by assuming his whole nature, consisting of body and soul. (Similar views had been formerly held by Irenæus, and were afterwards more fully developed by Anselm.) Gregory thus strongly maintained the doctrine of the two natures of the Saviour. We must distinguish in Christ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο, but not ἄλλος καὶ ἄλλος. Compare the Epist. ad Nectar. sive orat. 46, with his 10 anathemas against Apollinaris, and *Ullmann*, p. 396–413. The work of Gregory of Nyssa entitled λόγος ἀντιῤῥητικὸς πρὸς τὰ 'Απολλιναρίου (which was probably composed between the years 374 and 380), may be found in *Zaccagni* Collect. monum. vett. and *Gallandi*, Bibl. Patr. vi. p. 517. Comp. *Gieseler*, i. § 83, note 30. *Rupp*, p. 139.—He opposed the followers of Apollinaris (Συνουσιασταί, Διμοιριταί) in his Ep. hær. 77.—The doctrine of Apollinaris was also condemned in the West by Damasus, bishop of Rome (comp. *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 277), and once more by the second Œcumenical synod of Constantinople (A. D. 381. Can. i. vii.)—On the question, whether Apollinaris or his disciples ever adopted the Docetic errors respecting the body of Christ? see *Möhler*, l. c. p. 264, ss.

§ 100.

THE DOCTRINE OF NESTORIUS.

Jablonski, P. E., exercitatio historico-theologica de Nestorianismo. Berol. 1724.—Tübinger Quartalschrift 1835, ii. part 1.

The desire of preserving the perfect human nature of

---

[a] But he remarks more justly, p. 263: "*It is the more to be regretted that Apollinaris fell into such errors, as he devised his doctrine for the purpose of defending the Divinity of the Redeemer.*"

Christ together with the Divine, led from time to time to the inquiry, whether that which the Scriptures relate respecting the life and actions of the Redeemer, his birth, sufferings, and death, refers only to his humanity, or to his Divine as well as to his human nature; and if the latter, in what respect it may be said to refer to both? While the teachers of the Alexandrian school asserted in strong terms the *unity* of the Divine and the human in Christ, the theologians of Antioch, *Diodorus of Tarsus*, and *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, made a strict distinction between the one and the other.(1) At last the phrase: mother of God (ϑεοτόκος)(2) which the increasing homage paid to the Virgin had brought into use, gave rise to the controversy respecting the two natures of Christ. *Nestorius,* patriarch of Constantinople, disapproved of the phrase in question, maintaining that Mary had given birth to Christ, but not to God.(3) *Cyrill,* patriarch of Alexandria, opposed him, and both pronounced anathemas against each other.(4) Nestorius supposed, in accordance with the Antiochian mode of thinking, that the Divine and the human natures of Christ ought to be distinctly separated, and admitted only a συνάφεια (junction) of the one and the other, an ἐνοίκησις (indwelling) of the Deity. Cyrill, on the contrary, was led by his Egyptian notions, to maintain the perfect union of the two natures (φυσικὴ ἕνωσις.) Nestorius was condemned by the synod of Ephesus (A. D. 431.)(5) but the controversy was not brought to a close.

(1) *Diodorus* died A. D. 394. Some fragments of his treatise: πρὸς τοὺς Συνουσιαστάς, are preserved in a Latin translation by Mar. Mercator, edit. *Baluze*, p. 349, ss. (*Garner*, p. 317.) and Leontius Byzantinus. Comp. *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, p. 280: Adoramus purpuram propter indutum et templum propter inhabitatorem, etc.—The opinions of *Theodore* are expressed in his confession of faith, which may be found in Acta Conc. Ephes.

Actio vi. quoted by *Mansi*, T. iv. p. 1347, and Marius Mercator (*Garner* i. p. 95.) *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 280. On his controversy with Apollinaris see *Fritzsche*, p. 92, 101. Comp. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 3, p. 929–944.

(2) Concerning the ecclesiastical meaning of this term, which came gradually into use, see Socrat. vii. 32. *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, i. 286. The absurd discussions on the partus virgineus, (comp. *e. g.* Rufinus expos. 20.) where Mary is called the porta Domini, per quam introivit in mundum, etc. belong to the same class.

(3) *Anastasius*, a presbyter of Alexandria, (A. D. 428), preached against the use of the term in question, and thus called forth the present controversy. He was followed by *Nestorius* (a disciple of Theodore of Mopsuestia). Socrat. vii. 32. *Leporius*, a presbyter and monk at Massilia, and follower of Pelagius, had previously propounded a similar doctrine in the West, see *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 282. The views of *Nestorius* himself are contained in iii. (ii.) Sermones Nestorii, quoted by Mar. Mercator, p. 53–74. *Mansi*, iv. p. 1197. *Garner*, ii. p. 3, ss. He rejected the appellation "mother of God" as heathenish and contrary to Heb. vii. 3. Resting, as he did, on the orthodox doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son, he could say: Non peperit creatura eum, qui est increabilis, non recentem de virgine Deum Verbum genuit Pater. In principio erat enim verbum, sicut Joh. (i. 1.) ait. Non peperit creatura creatorem [increabilem], sed peperit hominem, Deitatis instrumentum. Non creavit Deum Verbum Spir. S......sed Deo Verbo templum fabricatus est, quod habitaret, ex virgine, etc. But Nestorius by no means refused to worship the human nature of Christ in its connection with the Divine, and strongly protested against the charge of separating the two natures: Propter utentem illud indumentum, quo utitur, colo, propter absconditum adoro, quod foris videtur. Inseparabilis ab eo, qui oculis paret, est Deus. Quomodo igitur ejus, qui non dividitur, honorem [ego] et dignitatem audeam separare? Divido naturas, sed conjungo reverentiam (quoted by *Garner*, p. 3.) and in the fragment given by *Mansi*, p. 1201: Διὰ τὸν φοροῦντα τὸν φορούμενον σέβω, διὰ τὸν κεκρυμμένον προσκυνῶ τὸν φαινόμενον· ἀχώριστος τοῦ φαινομένου θεός· διὰ τοῦτο τοῦ μὴ χωριζομένου τὴν τιμὴν οὐ χωρίζω· χωρίζω τὰς φύσεις, ἀλλ' ἐνῶ τὴν προσκύνησιν. He preferred calling Mary Θεοδόχος or Χριστοτόκος instead of Θεοτόκος. Comp.

the other passages in *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 284–286. *Baur*, Gesch. der Trinitat. i. p. 727, ss.

(4) On the external history of this controversy, see the works on ecclesiastical history. It commenced with a correspondence between Nestorius and Cyrill, in which they charged each other with separating and confounding the two natures of Christ. *Cyrill* was supported by Cælestinus, bishop of Rome, *Nestorius* by the eastern bishops in general, and John, bishop of Antioch, in particular. In the course of the controversy Nestorius declared himself willing, even to adopt the term ϑεοτόκος, if properly explained. Comp. the Acta, and especially the anathemas themselves in *Mansi*, v. p. 1, ss., and iv. p. 1099, in Mar. Mercator, p. 142. (*Garner*, ii. 77, ss.) reprinted in *Baumgarten's* theologische Streitigkeiten, vol. ii. p. 770, ss. *Gieseler*, Lehrb. der Kirchengesch. i. § 88, note 20. *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 290–295.

(5) The acts of the Synod are given in *Mansi*, iv. p. 1123. Fuchs. iv. p. 1, ss. The synod was overruled by Cyrill. An anti-synod was held under John, bishop of Antioch, in opposition to Cyrill and Memnon; these in their turn excommunicated John and his party. The Emperor Theodosius at first confirmed the sentence of deposition which the two contending parties had pronounced upon each other, but afterwards restricted it to Nestorius, who was abandoned by all. John of Antioch himself was prevailed upon to give his consent to the condemnation of his friend after Cyrill had signed a confession of faith which more or less contradicted his former anathemas, (comp. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 297.) The consequence was, the separation of the Nestorian party (Chaldean Christians, Thomas-Christians) from the catholic church; on the history of the Nestorians, see *J. S. Assemanni*, de Syris Nestorianis in Bibl. Orient. Rom. 1728, T. iii. P. 2. "*We may call the view of Cyrill (according to which the human is changed into the Divine), the* SUPERNATURAL *aspect of the union in question, and that of Nestor (according to which the two natures are only joined together) the* MECHANICAL." *Dorner*, p. 90.

§ 101.

EUTYCHIAN-MONOPHYSITE CONTROVERSY.

The doctrine which *separated the two natures of*

Christ, had been rejected by the condemnation of Nestorius. But with the growing influence and power of the party of Cyrill, which was headed by *Dioscurus,* Cyrill's successor,(1) the still greater danger arose of *confounding,* instead of *separating* the said natures. The zeal of *Eutyches,* an archimandrite [abbot] at Constantinople, who maintained the doctrine of one nature alone of Christ, (2) caused new disturbances. Dioscurus endeavoured to force the Monophysite doctrine by violent means upon the eastern church,(3) but both he, and his sentiments, were at last condemned at the council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451.) In the course of the controversy *Leo the Great,* bishop of Rome, had addressed a letter to *Flavian,* bishop of Constantinople.(4) On the basis of this Epistola Flaviana the synod pronounced in favour of the doctrine of two natures, which should neither be separated nor confounded, and, in order to prevent further errors, drew up a confession of faith, which should be binding upon all parties.(5)

---

(1) Respecting his character and violent conduct, especially towards Theodoret, see *Neander,* Kirchengeschichte, ii. 3, p. 1064, ss. The acts of this controversy are given in *Mansi,* T. vi. vii. (*Ang. Mai.* Script. vett. Coll. T. vii. and ix. Coll. Class. Auct. T. x. p. 408, ss.)

(2) *Eutyches* was charged by Eusebius of Dorylæum with the revival of Valentinian and Apollinarian errors, and deposed by a synod held at Constantinople in the year 449. See *Mansi,* vi. p. 694–754. According to the acts of this synod he taught: Μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου, τουτέστι μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μίαν φύσιν προσκυνεῖν καὶ ταύτην θεοῦ σαρκωθέντος καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντος. He denied that the flesh of Christ was of the same essence (ὁμοούσιος) with ours, though he would not be understood to teach, that Christ brought his body with him from heaven. But when his opponents brought him at last to a dilemma, he went so far as to admit the sameness of essence in respect to the body. But he could not be induced to confess his belief in the existence of two natures, a Divine and a human.

He maintained that there had been two natures only πρὸ τῆς ἐνώσεως; but after that he would acknowledge only *one*. Concerning the agreement subsisting between his doctrine and that of Cyrill, see *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, p. 301.

(3) These violent proceedings were carried to an extreme length at the *Synod of Robbers*, A. D. 449. (Latrocinium Ephesinum, σύνοδος ληστρική) the acts of which may be found in *Mansi*, vi. p. 593, ss. *Fuchs*, iv. p. 340, ss.

(4) The epistle in question is given in *Mansi*, v. p. 1359, (separately published by *K. Phil. Henke*, Helmst. 1780, 4, comp. *Griesbach* opusc. acad. T. i. p. 52, ss. Comp. *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 302.): Salva proprietate utriusque naturæ et substantiæ et in unam coëunte personam, suscepta est a majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab æternitate mortalitas; et ad resolvendum conditionis nostræ debitum natura inviolabilis naturæ est unita passibili, ut quod nostris remediis congruebat, unus atque idem mediator dei et hominum, homo Jesus Christus, et mori posset ex uno et mori non posset ex altero. In integra ergo veri hominis perfectaque natura verus natus est Deus, totus in suis, totus in nostris etc. Qui enim verus est Deus, idem verus est homo, et nullum est in hac unitate mendacium, dum invicem sunt et humilitas hominis et altitudo deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non mutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate. Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est: Verbo scilicet operante, quod verbi est, et carne exsequente, quod carnis est etc. He then ascribes birth, hunger, nakedness, sufferings, death, burial, etc., to the human, the miracles to the Divine nature; the passage in John xiv. 28, refers to the former, that in John x. 30, to the latter.

(5) *Mansi*, vii. 108, ss. :...'Επόμενοι τοίνυν τοῖς ἁγίοις πατράσιν, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ὁμολογεῖν υἱὸν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν συμφώνως ἅπαντες ἐκδιδάσκομεν, τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν θεότητι καὶ τέλειον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐν ἀνθρωπότητι, θεὸν ἀληθῶς καὶ ἄνθρωπον ἀληθῶς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκ ψυχῆς λογικῆς καὶ σώματος, ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ὁμοούσιον τὸν αὐτὸν ἡμῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον ἡμῖν χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας· πρὸ αἰώνων μὲν ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα κατὰ τὴν θεότητα, ἐπ' ἐσχάτων δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν αὐτὸν δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν ἐκ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου τῆς θεοτόκου κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν Υἱὸν, Κύριον, μονογενῆ ἐκ δύο φύσεων (ἐν δύο φύσεσιν)[a] ἀσυγχύτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀχωρίστως

---

[a] Concerning the different reading comp. *Mansi*, p. 106, 775, 840. *Walch*, bibl. symb. p. 106.

γνωριζόμενον· οὐδαμοῦ τῆς τῶν φύσεων διαφορᾶς ἀνῃρημένης διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν, σωζομένης δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἰδιότητος ἑκατέρας φύσεως καὶ εἰς ἓν πρόσωπον καὶ μίαν ὑπόστασιν συντρεχούσης· οὐκ εἰς δύο πρόσωπα μεριζόμενον, ἢ διαιρούμενον, ἀλλ' ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν Υἱόν καὶ μονογενῆ, θεόν λόγον, κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν· καθάπερ ἄνωθεν οἱ προφῆται περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτος ἡμᾶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐξεπαίδευσε· καὶ τὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε σύμβολον.

We cannot fail to perceive a dogmatic parallel between the decisions of this synod respecting the nature of Christ, and those of the council of Nice, with this difference only, that the latter understood by *φύσις* that which belongs to each nature separately, but by *ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον*, that which both have in common; the reverse is the case in the decisions of the synod of Chalcedon.

§ 102.

PROGRESS OF THE CONTROVERSY.—THEOPASCHITISM.

But the authority of the decision of the Synod of Chalcedon was not at once generally acknowledged. Many conflicts ensued (1) before the doctrine of "*two natures in one person*" was received as the orthodox doctrine of the church, and finally inserted into what is commonly called the Athanasian Creed.(2) The exact medium, however, between the two extreme views was not strictly preserved. For by the admission of a new clause, viz. that one of the Divine persons had been crucified *(Theopaschitism)*, into the creed of the fifth œcumenical synod (A. D. 553),(3) the Monophysite notion gained the ascendancy within the pale of the church.

(1) The *Henoticon* of the Emperor Zeno, A. D. 482, in Evagr. iii. c. 14, (separately published by *Berger*, Wittemb. 1723, 4,) was intended to bring about a reconciliation between the contending parties, but was not followed by any permanent success. Comp. *Jablonsky*, Diss. de Henotico Zenonis. Francof. ad Viadr. 1737. 4. *Münscher* v. Cölln, p. 306, 7.

(2) Symb. Athan. pars. ii.—(Comp. § 97.)

27. Sed necessarium est ad æternam salutem, ut incarnationem quoque Domini nostri Jesu Christi fideliter credat. 28. Est

ergo fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, Dei filius, Deus pariter et homo est. Deus est ex substantia Patris ante sæcula genitus: homo ex substantia matris in sæculo natus. 30. Perfectus deus, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens. 31. Æqualis Patri secundum divinitatem, minor Patre secundum humanitatem. 32. Qui licet deus sit et homo, non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus. 33. Unus autem non conversione divinitatis in carnem, sed assumtione humanitatis in Deum. 34. Unus omnino non confusione substantiarum, sed unitate personæ. 35. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo, ita et Deus et homo unus est Christus. 36. Qui passus est pro salute nostra, descendit ad inferos, tertia die resurrexit a mortuis, 37. ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. 38. Ad cujus adventum omnes homines resurgere debent cum corporibus suis et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem. 39. Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam æternam: qui vero mala, in ignem æternum. 40. Hæc est fides catholica, quam nisi quisquam fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.

(3) *Peter Fullo* (ὁ γναφεὺς) was the first who introduced the clause ϑεὸς ἐσταυϱώϑη into the Trishagion. [On the τϱισάγιον see Gieseler, l. c. i. § 110, note 12.] He was, however, banished by an imperial decree about the year 470.—In the year 533 Justinian pronounced the phrase *unum crucifixum esse ex sancta et consubtantiali Trinitate* to be orthodox, (Cod. L. 1. Tit. l. 6:) he did so in accordance with John II. bishop of Rome, but in opposition to his predecessor Hormisdas.—The decree of the council is given in *Mansi*, ix. p. 304: Εἴ τις οὐχ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν ἐσταυϱωμένον σαϱκὶ Κύϱιον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χϱιστὸν εἶναι ϑεὸν ἀληϑινὸν καὶ κύϱιον τῆς δόξης, καὶ ἕνα τῆς ἁγίας τϱίαδος· ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀνάϑεμα ἔστω.—This victory of the advocates of Theopaschitism was only the counterpart of the one which the friends of the phrase ϑεοτόκος had gained in former years. Thus such expressions as "God is born, God died," came gradually into use in dogmatic theology. It was in this sense that, *e. g.* the author of the soliloquia animæ (which may be found in the works of Augustine) c. 1, offered the following prayer: Manus tuæ, Domine, fecerunt me et plasmaverunt me, manus inquam illæ, quæ affixæ clavis sunt pro me.

§ 103.

VARIOUS FEATURES OF THE MONOPHYSITE DOCTRINE. APHTHARDOCETÆ, PHTHARTOLATRI, AGNOËTÆ.

Gieseler, J. C. L., commentatio, qua monophysitarum veterum variæ de Christi persona opiniones inprimis ex ipsorum effatis recens editis illustrantur. Parts I. II. Gött. 1838. IV.

The Monophysites themselves were not agreed on the question whether Christ possessed a corruptible, or an incorruptible body? The *Phthartolatri* (Severians) maintained the former, the *Aphthardocetæ* (Julianists) asserted the latter, in accordance with their opinions respecting the nature of Christ. Different views obtained among the Aphthardocetæ themselves on the question whether Christ's body was created or not, and led to the formation of two distinct parties, the *Ktistolatri* and the *Akstitetæ*. The omniscience of Christ necessarily followed from the Monophysite doctrine. The assertion, therefore, of *Themistius*, deacon of Alexandria, that the man Jesus had been ignorant of many things (*Agnoetism*, Mark xiii. 32; Luke ii. 52;) was rejected by the strict Monophysites.

Sources: Leont. Byzant. (in *Gallandii* Bibl. Patr. xii.) Niceph. Callisti, lib. xvii. *Gieseler* (in the 2d Part of the dissertation cited before) endeavours to prove, that the view of the Julianists was by no means purely Docetic, but allied to that taken by *Clement of Alexandria*, *Hilary*, *Gregory of Nyssa*, etc., and also bore resemblance to the opinions entertained by *Apollinaris*. *Xenaias* (Philoxenus), bishop of Hierapolis, and the contemporary of *Julian*, bishop of Halicarnassus, appears as the representative of this view, comp. p. 7. Different meanings were attached to the word φθορά, which was made at one time to denote the frailty of the living body, and its susceptibility of undergoing sufferings, at another to signify the dissolubility of the corpse; ibidem, p. 4.

Though the orthodox church was far from giving the least countenance to Docetism, yet the ideas entertained by Origen in the preceding period (see § 66, note 6,) viz. *that Christ rose from the tomb with a glorified body*, found many more friends in the present period. Not only *Hilary*, whose views, generally speaking, come nearest to those of the Docetæ, but also *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, and most of the eastern theologians, with the exception of *Ephraim the Syrian*, *Gregory of Nyssa*, and *Cyrill of Jerusalem*, more or less adopted the notion of Origen. Thus Chrysostom says in reference to John xxi. 10: ἐφαίνετο γὰρ ἄλλῃ μορφῇ, ἄλλῃ φωνῇ, ἄλλῳ σχήματι; in support of his opinion he appealed especially to the appearance of Christ when the doors were shut, etc. On the other hand, the last mentioned Fathers of the eastern church, as well as the western theologians, *Jerome* in particular, asserted that Christ possessed the very same body both prior and anterior to his resurrection. *Cyrill* firmly maintains that Christ was ἐν σώματι παχεῖ. *Augustine* and *Leo the Great*, on the contrary, endeavoured to reconcile the notion of the identity of Christ's body with the idea of its glorification. Thus Leo says in Sermo 69, de resurrect. dom. cap. 4, (T. i. p. 73): resurrectio Domini non finis carnis, sed commutatio fuit, nec virtutis augmento consumta substantia est. Qualitas transiit, non natura defecit: et factum est corpus impassibile, immortale, incorruptibile...nihil remansit in carne Christi infirmum, ut et ipsa sit per essentiam et non sit ipsa per gloriam. *Gregory the Great* and others used similar language.—Most of the theologians of this period also adhered to the opinion, that *Christ had quickened himself by his own power*, in opposition to the notion entertained by the Arians, viz. that the Father had raised him from the dead. For the doctrine of the two natures in Christ led them to imagine, that the union subsisting between the Divine and the human was so intimate and permanent, that both his body and soul, after their natural separation by death, continued to be connected with his Divine nature, the one in the grave, the other in Hades. Nor did Christ stand in need of the angel to roll away the stone; this took place only in consequence of his resurrection.—His ascension was likewise brought about by an independent act of his Divine nature, but not by a miracle wrought by the Father upon him, (generally speaking, theologians were accustomed at this time to consider the miracles of Christ as effects produced by his Divine nature.) The cloud which formerly enveloped all the events of Christ's life, was now changed into a triumphal car (ὄχημα) which angels accompanied. Comp. *Athan.* de assumt. dom., and for further particulars see *Müller*, l. c. p. 40, ss. p. 83, ss.

§ 104.

THE DOCTRINE OF TWO WILLS IN CHRIST.—MONOTHELITES.

Combefisii, T., historia Monothelitarum in the second volume of his Nov. Auctuarium Bibl. PP. græco-latin. Par. 1648. fol. *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereien, vol. ix. p. 1—606.

The attempt made by the Emperor Heraclius in the seventh century, to re-unite the Monophysites with the

Catholic church, led to the controversy respecting the two wills in Christ which was allied to that concerning his natures.(1) In accordance with *Cyrus,* patriarch of Alexandria, the emperor, hoping to reconcile the two parties, adopted the doctrine of only *one* Divine-human energy (ἐνεργέια), and of *one* volition in Christ.(2) But *Sophronius,* an acute monk of Palestine, and afterwards patriarch of Jerusalem, (A. D. 635), endeavoured to show that this doctrine was inadmissible, since the doctrine of two natures set forth by the synod of Chalcedon necessarily implied that of two wills.(3) After several fruitless attempts had been made to establish the Monothelite doctrine,(4) the sixth œcumenical council of Constantinople (A. D. 680), with the co-operation of the bishop of Rome,(5) adopted the doctrine of *two* wills, and *two* energies as the orthodox doctrine, but decided that the human will should always be regarded as subordinate to the Divine.(6)

---

(1) In this way the controversy was removed from the province of pure metaphysics to that of Christian ethics, and touched upon questions which more properly belong to anthropology. But this did not affect the thing itself.

(2) When the Emperor Heraclius, in the course of his campaign against Persia, passed through Armenia and Syria, he came to an understanding with the Monophysite leaders of the Severians and Jacobites, and induced *Sergius,* the orthodox patriarch of Constantinople, to give his assent to the doctrine of ἓν θέλημα καὶ μία ἐνέργεια, or of an ἐνέργεια θεανδρική. *Cyrus* (a Monophysite) whom the Emperor had appointed patriarch of Alexandria, effected, at a synod held in that town, (A. D. 633,) a union between the different parties. The acts of this synod are given by *Mansi,* Conc. xi. p. 564, ss., as well as the letters of Cyrus, ibid. p. 561.

(3) See Sophronii Epist. Synodica, which is given in *Mansi,* xi. 461. Those Monophysites who maintained the doctrine of two natures, and of only *one* will, were quite as inconsistent as most of the orthodox theologians in the Arian controversy, who held that the Son was of the same essence with the Father, but asserted the subordination of the Spirit.

(4) The Greek Emperors endeavoured at first to settle the matter amicably, by the Ἔκθεσις [*i. e.* an edict issued by the Emperor Heraclius, A. D. 638, in which he confirmed the agreement made by the patriarchs for the preservation of ecclesiastical union], and the Τύπος [*i. e.* an edict issued by the Emperor Constans II. A D. 648, in which the contending parties were prohibited to resume their discussions on the doctrine in question]. See *Mansi*, x. p. 992. p. 1029, ss. Afterwards Pope Martin I. and Maximus were treated with the greatest cruelty; for further particulars see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. iii. p. 377, ss.

(5) Pope *Honorius* was in favour of the union, but his successors *Severinus*, and *John IV.* opposed it. The latter condemned the doctrine of the Monothelites, and Pope *Theodore* excommunicated Paul, patriarch of Constantinople, till the doctrine of *two* wills and *two* energies was at last adopted at the first synod of the Lateran held under Pope *Martin I.* in the year 649, see *Mansi*, x. p. 863, ss.: Si quis secundum scelerosos hæreticos cum una voluntate et una operatione, quæ ab hæreticis impie confitetur, et duas voluntates, pariterque et operationes, hoc est, divinam et humanam, quæ in ipso Christo Deo in unitate salvantur, et a sanctis patribus orthodoxe in ipso prædicantur, denegat et respuit, condemnatus sit. (Comp. *Gieseler*, l. c. § 128, note 11. *Münscher* v. Cölln, ii. 78, 79.)

(6) This council was summoned by *Constantinus Pogonatus*. The decision of the synod was based upon the epistle of Pope *Agatho*, which was itself founded upon the canons of the above synod of the Latin church (Agathonis ep. ad Imperatores in *Mansi*, xi. 233–286); Agatho expressed in it his belief in duas naturales voluntates et duas naturales operationes, non contrarias, nec adversas, nec separatas, etc. This was followed by the decision of the council itself (see *Mansi*, xi. 631, ss. *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, ii. p. 80. *Gieseler*, l. c. § 128, notes 14–17.) Δύο φυσικὰς θελήσεις ἤτοι θελήματα ἐν Χριστῷ καὶ δύο φυσικὰς ἐνεργείας ἀδιαιρέτως, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμερίστως, ἀσυγχύτως, κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων διδασκαλίαν κηρύττομεν. καὶ δύο φυσικὰ θελήματα οὐχ ὑπεναντία, μὴ γένοιτο, καθὼς οἱ ἀσεβεῖς ἔφησαν αἱρετικοί· ἀλλ' ἑπόμενον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον αὐτοῦ θέλημα, καὶ μὴ ἀντιπίπτον, ἢ ἀντιπαλαῖον, μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν καὶ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ θείῳ αὐτοῦ καὶ πανσθενεῖ θελήματι.—Respecting the insufficiency of these, and the indefiniteness of the other canons of the council, see *Dorner*, p. 99, ss. The reformers did not recognize the decisions of this council. The Monothelites (Pope Honorius included)

were condemned. They continued to exist as a distinct sect in the mountains of Lebanon and Antilebanon under the name of Maronites (which was derived from their leader, the Syrian abbot *Marun*, who lived about the year 701.) Comp. *Neander*, l. c. p. 398.

§ 105.

PRACTICO-RELIGIOUS IMPORTANCE OF CHRISTOLOGY DURING THIS PERIOD.

The sight of these manifold controversies, in which the person of the Redeemer is made the object of passionate conflicts, is certainly far from being pleasant. Still it is cheering to see, how the faith of Christians in those times was both supported by that idea of the Godman, which was above all such strife, and how it gave to the doctrine of the one and undivided person of Christ its due import.

" *All the Fathers agreed, as it were with one accord, that not only that limited importance is attached to the person of Christ, which belongs to every individual in history, but that he stands in an essential relation to the* WHOLE HUMAN RACE ; *on this account alone they could make a* SINGLE INDIVIDUAL *the subject of an article of faith, and ascribe to him a lasting and eternal importance relative to our race.*" *Dorner*, l. c. p. 78.

SECOND DIVISION.

DOCTRINES RESPECTING ANTHROPOLOGY.

§ 106.

ON MAN IN GENERAL.

The more distinctly the pre-existence of the Son was asserted in connection with the idea of a Divine hypostasis, the more necessary it became to guard against every thing which would seem to favour the notion, that the case of man was somewhat analogous to that of

Christ. Hence Origen's doctrine of the pre-existence of the human soul, which none but *Nemesius* and *Prudentius* ventured any longer to defend,(1) was rejected as erroneous.(2) Some writers still adhered to the theory of Tertullian respecting the propagation of the soul per traducem (*Traducianism,* comp. § 55.), which was in one respect favourable to the doctrine of original sin. But during the present period another scheme came to be more generally adopted, which is known under the name of *Creatianism.* Its advocates thought that every human soul was created as such, and at a certain moment of time united with the body, developing itself in the womb. Others again preferred avoiding all definitions of this kind.(3) In the West the threefold division of man (§ 54.) gave way to the simple division into body and soul, on the mutual relation of which different views obtained among the Fathers of the present period.(4) Nor did they agree in their opinions respecting the image of God, though most of them admitted that it consisted in the intellectual faculties of man, in his capacity of knowing God, and in the authority which he exercises over the irrational creation.(5) There were still some who imagined that the image was also reflected in the body of man; but while the *Audiani* perverted this notion in support of gross anthropomorphism,(6) others gave to it a spiritual interpretation. The immortality of the soul was generally believed; *Lactantius* however did not regard it as the natural property of the soul, but as the reward of virtue.(7)

(1) The former did so as philosopher (de humana natura 2, p. 76, ss. of the Oxford edit.), the latter as poet (Cathemerin. hymn. x. v. 161—168.)

(2) Conc. Const. A. D. 540, see *Mansi,* ix. p. 396, ss.: Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῖς θείοις ἐπομένη λόγοις φάσκει τὴν ψυχὴν συνδημιουργηθῆναι τῷ σώματι· καὶ οὐ τὸ μὲν πρότερον, τὸ δὲ ὕστερον, κατὰ τὴν Ὠριγένους φρενοβλάβειαν.

(3) *Lactantius* maintains, Inst. iii. 18, that the soul is born with

the body, and distinctly opposes Traducianism, de opif. Dei ad Demetr. c. 19.: Illud quoque venire in quæstionem potest, utrum anima ex patre, an potius ex matre, an vero ex utroque generetur. Nihil enim ex his tribus verum est, quia neque ex utroque, neque ex alterutro seruntur animæ. Corpus enim ex corporibus nasci potest, quoniam confertur aliquid ex utroque; de animis anima non potest, quia ex re tenui et incomprehensibili nihil potest decedere. Itaque serendarum animarum ratio uni ac soli Deo subjacet:

> "Denique cœlesti sumus omnes semine oriundi,
> Omnibus ille idem pater est,"

ut ait Lucretius; nam de mortalibus non potest quidquam nisi mortale generari. Nec putari pater debet, qui transfudisse aut inspirasse animam de suo nullo modo sentit; nec, si sentiat, quando tamen et quomodo id fiat, habet animo comprehensum. Ex quo apparet, non a parentibus dari animas, sed ab uno eodemque omnium Deo patre, qui legem rationemque nascendi tenet solus, siquidem solus efficit; nam terreni parentis nihil est, nisi ut humorem corporis, in quo est materia nascendi, cum sensu voluptatis emittat vel recipiat, et citra hoc opus homo resistit, nec quidquam amplius potest; ideo nasci sibi filios optant, quia non ipsi faciunt. Cetera jam Dei sunt omnia: scilicet conceptus ipse et corporis informatio et inspiratio animæ et partus incolumis et quæcunque deinceps ad hominem conservandum valent; *illius* munus est, quod spiramus, quod vivimus, quod vigemus.—In opposition to Traducianism he appeals to the fact, that intelligent parents have sometimes stupid children, and vice versa, which could not well be ascribed to the influence of the stars!—In accordance with this opinion *Hilary* asserts Tract. in Ps. xci. § 3: Quotidie animarum origenes occulta et incognita nobis divinæ virtutis molitione procedunt. *Pelagius* and the Semipelagians *Cassian* and *Gennadius* adopted substantially the same view, see *Wiggers*, Augustin und Pelagius, i. p. 149, ii. p. 354. Pelagius taught (in Symb. quoted by *Mansi*, iv. p. 355): Animas a Deo dari credimus, quas ab ipso factas dicimus, anathematizontes eos, qui animas quasi partem divinæ dicunt esse substantiæ; *Augustine* agreed with him as far as the negative aspect of this proposition was concerned, Retract. i. 1: (Deus) animum non de se ipso genuit, sed de re nulla alia condidit, sicut condidit corpus e terra; this refers, however, in the first place, to the creation of our first parents. But he did not expressly state, whether he thought that the soul was newly created in every case; on the contrary, he declined to investigate this point: Nam quod attinet ad ejus (animi) originem, qua fit ut sit in corpore, utrum de illo uno sit, qui primum creatus est, quando factus est homo in animam vivam, an semper ita fiant singulis singuli, nec tunc sciebam (in his treatise contra Academicos) nec adhuc scio. Comp. Ep. 140, (al. 120,) ad Honorat. (T. ii. p. 320.)—The phrase mentioned before, (note 2.): *τὴν ψυχὴν συνδημιουργηθῆναι τῷ σώματι*, which was used by the Greek church, and is also found in the works of *Theodoret*, (fab. hær. v. 9, p. 414,) implies the doctrine commonly called Creatianism. Yet Traducianism continued to be professed not only by heterodox writers, *e. g. Eunomius* and *Apollinaris*, but also by some orthodox theologians, such as *Gregory of Nyssa*, de hom. opif. c. 29. The last directs our attention to the fact, that body and soul belong essentially together, and cannot be possibly imagined to be separated from each other: Ἀλλ' ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τοῦ διὰ ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος συνεστηκότος, μίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ κοινὴν τῆς συστάσεως τὴν ἀρχὴν ὑποτίθεσθαι, ὡς ἂν μὴ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ προγενέστερός τε καὶ νεώτερος γένοιτο, τοῦ μὲν σωματικοῦ προτερεύοντος ἐν αὐτῷ, τοῦ δὲ ἑτέρου ἐφυστερίζοντος, etc. which he proves by analogies drawn from nature. The views of *Anastasius Sinaïta* on this point are very carnal (Hom. in *Bandini* monum. eccles. gr. T. ii. p. 54, in *Münscher* von Colln, i. p. 332): Τὸ μὲν σῶμα ἐκ τῆς γυναικείας γῆς καὶ αἵματος συνίσταται· ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ διὰ τῆς σπορᾶς, ὥσπερ διά τινος ἐμφυσήματος ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀῤῥήτως μεταδίδοται. According to *Jerome*, Ep. 78, ad Marcellin, (Opp. T. iv. p. 642, ap. Erasm. ii. p. 318) even maxima pars occidentalium entertained the opinion, ut quomodo corpus ex corpore, sic anima nascatur ex anima et simili cum brutis animantibus conditione subsistat. But Jerome himself rejects all other systems, and designates *Creatianism* as the orthodox doctrine,[a] Epist. ad Pammach. (Opp. T. iv. p. 318, ap. Erasm. ii. p. 170): Quotidie Deus fabricatur animas, cujus velle fecisse est et conditor esse non cessat......Noli despicere bonitatem figuli tui, qui te plasmavit et fecit ut voluit. Ipse est Dei virtus et Dei sapientia, qui in utero virginis ædificavit sibi domum. The advocates of Creatianism saw in the birth of every human being something analogous to the miracle of Christ's incarnation, without identifying the one with the other (which Jerome would have been the last to do); those who adopted Traducianism were compelled to consider Christ's birth as an exception to the rule; but even this exception required some restriction on account of the equality subsisting between his human nature and ours. Many theologians, therefore, preferred obviating these difficulties by following Augustine's example, who pointed out the impossibility of comprehending the origin of existence. Thus *Gregory the Great*, Epp. vii. 59, ad Secundinum (Opp. ii. p. 970) says: Sed de hac re dulcissima mihi tua caritas sciat, quia de origine animæ inter sanctos Patres requisitio non parva versata est; sed utrum ipsa ab Adam descenderit, an certe singulis detur, incertum remansit, eamque in hac vita insolubilem fassi sunt esse quæstionem. Gravis enim est quæstio, nec valet ab homine comprehendi, quia si de Adam substantia cum carne nascitur, cur non etiam cum carne moritur? Si vero cum carne non nascitur, cur in ea carne, quæ de Adam prolata est, obligata peccatis tenetur? (he thus deduces Traducianism from the doctrine of original sin, the correctness of which he assumes, while the latter, on the contrary, was generally inferred from the former.)

---

[a] *Leo the Great* likewise declares it to be the doctrine of the church, (Ep. 15, ad Turrib. Opp. *Quesnel*, p. 229, quoted in *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 331, note 11: Catholica fides...omnem hominem in corporis et animæ substantiam *formari* intra materna viscera confitetur.

(4) *Hilary* of Poitiers asserts in Matth. can. v. § 8, that the soul, whether in the body or out of the body, must always preserve its corporeal substance, because everything that is created, must exist in some form or other (in aliquo sit necesse est.) This sentiment reminds us of the notions of Tertullian. But elsewhere he looks upon the soul as a spiritual, incorporeal being. Comp. in Ps. lii. § 7, in cxxix. § 6, (nihil in se habens corporale, nihil terrenum, nihil grave, nihil caducum.)—*Augustine* frankly acknowledges the difficulty of defining the relation in which the soul stands to the body, de morib. eccles. cath. c. 4: Difficile est istam controversiam dijudicare, aut si ratione facile, oratione longum est. Quem laborem ac moram suscipere ac subire non opus est. Sive enim utrumque sive anima sola nomen hominis teneat, non est hominis optimum quod optimum est corporis, sed quod aut corpori simul et animæ aut soli animæ optimum est, id est optimum hominis.—On the psychological views of Augustine comp. *Schleiermacher*, Geschichte der Phi-

losophie, p. 169, ss., on those of *Claudius Mamertus* and *Boëthius,* ibid. p. 174.—According to *Gregory the Great,* man is composed of body and soul (Mor. xiv. c. 15.) The principal qualities of the soul are mens, anima et virtus, comp. *Lau,* p. 370.

(5) *Greg. Nyss.* in verba: faciamus hominem, Orat. 1. Opp. i. p. 143: Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν· τουτέστι, δώσομεν αὐτῷ λόγου περιουσίαν...οὐ γὰρ τὰ πάθη εἰς τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰκόνα παρελήφθη, ἀλλ' ὁ λογισμὸς τῶν παθῶν δεσπότης. *Athanasius* speaks in the same manner, Orat. contra Gent. § 2. Cyrill. Hier. Cat. xiv. 10. The dominion over the animals was included. Gregory, l. c. says: ὅπου ἡ τοῦ ἄρχειν δύναμις, ἐκεῖ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰκών. Comp. Theodoret in genes. quæst. 20. Chrys. hom. viii. in Genes. Opp. ii. p. 65, ss. Aug. de catechizandis rudib. xvii. 20, de genesi contra Manich. c. 17, de Trin. xii. 2.—The Semipelagians, *Gennadius* and *Faustus,* made a distinction between *imago* and *similitudo,* see *Wiggers,* ii. p. 356. *Gregory the Great* regards the image of God in which man was created, as soliditas ingenita (Mor. ix. c. 33), which was lost by the fall (Mor. xxix. c. 10), see *Lau,* p. 371.

(6) *Audæus* (Udo), who lived at the commencement of the fourth century in Mesopotamia, a rigid and zealous ascetic, seems to have fallen into these errors through his essentially practical tendency. Comp. Epiph. hær. 70, who speaks very mildly of Audæus and his followers: οὔ τι ἔχων παρηλλαγμένον τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὀρθότατα μὲν πιστεύων αὐτός τε καὶ οἱ ἅμα αὐτῷ. Theodoret takes the opposite view, hist. eccles. iv. 10 (καινῶν εὑρετὴς δογμάτων), comp. fab. hær. iv. 10. *Schröder.* Diss. de hæresi Audianor. Marb. 1716. 4. *Neander,* Kirchengeschichte, ii. 3, p. 1465, ss.

(7) Lact. Instit. div. vii. 5, (in *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 336, comp. p. 338.) *Nemesius* likewise (cap. i. p. 15,) accedes in this point to the opinion of the earlier Greek theologians: Ἑβραῖοι δὲ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὔτε θνητὸν ὁμολογουμένως, οὔτε ἀθάνατον γεγενῆσθαί φασιν· ἀλλ' ἐν μεθορίοις ἑκατέρας φύσεως, ἵνα ἂν μὲν τοῖς σωματικοῖς ἀκολουθήσῃ πάθεσιν, περιπέσῃ καὶ ταῖς σωματικαῖς μεταβολαῖς· ἐὰν δὲ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς προτιμήσῃ λαλὰ, τῆς ἀθανασίας ἀξιωθῇ, κ. τ. λ.

§ 107.

ON THE DOCTRINE OF SIN IN GENERAL.

Concerning the origin of sin, the generally received opinion was, that it is to be ascribed to the will of man, and stands in the most intimate connection with his moral freedom. *Augustine* himself defended this doctrine (at least in his earlier writings),(1) which was opposed to the Manichæan notion, that evil is inherent in matter. *Lactantius,* on the contrary, manifested a strong leaning towards Manichæism by designating the body as the seat and organ of sin.(2) The ascetic practices then so common among Christians, sufficiently indicate, that the church tacitly approved of this view. *Athanasius* regarded sin as something negative, and believed it to consist in the blindness and indolence of man, which prevent him from elevating himself to God. Similar (negative) definitions were given by *Basil the Great,* and *Gregory of Nyssa.*(3) But sin was most frequently looked upon as opposition to the law of God, and rebellion against his holy will,(4) analogous to the sin of Adam, which was now generally admitted to be a historical fact (contrary to the allegorical interpretation of Origen.)(5)

---

(1) *Aug.* de duab. animab. contra Manich. § 12: Colligo nusquam nisi in *voluntate* esse peccatum—de lib. arb. iii. 49: Ipsa *voluntas* est prima causa peccandi.—In many other passages he regards sin from the negative point of view as a conversio a majori bono ad minus bonum, defectio ab eo, quod summa est, ad id, quod minus est, perversitas voluntatis a summa substantia detortæ in infimum. See the passages in *Julius Müller,* die Lehre von der Sünde, i. p. 340, ss.

(2) *Lact.* Inst. div. ii. 12, vi. 13, de ira Dei 15: Nemo esse sine delicto potest, quamdiu indumento carnis oneratus est. Cujus infirmitas triplici modo subjacet dominio peccati, factis, dictis, cogitationibus.

(3) *Athan.* contra gent. 4. (Opp. i. p. 4): Ὄντα δέ ἐστι τὰ καλὰ, οὐκ ὄντα δὲ τὰ φαῦλα· ὄντα δέ φημι τὰ καλὰ, καθότι ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος θεοῦ τὰ παραδείγματα ἔχει· οὐκ ὄντα δὲ τὰ κακὰ λέγω, καθότι ἐπινοίαις ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ὄντα ἀναπέπλασται· ibid. c. 7, p. 7: Ὅτι τὸ κακὸν οὐ παρὰ θεοῦ οὐδὲ ἐν θεῷ, οὔτε ἐξ ἀρχῆς γέγονεν, οὔτε οὐσία τίς ἐστιν αὐτοῦ· ἀλλὰ ἄνθρωποι κατὰ στέρησιν τῆς τοῦ καλοῦ φαντασίας ἑαυτοῖς ἐπινοεῖν ἤρξαντο καὶ ἀναπλάττειν τὰ οὐκ ὄντα· καὶ ἅπερ βούλονται. Comp. that which follows. Athanasius traces the evil propensity of man to in-

dolence, c. 3, p. 3: Οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι κατολιγωρήσαντες τῶν κρειτόνων, καὶ ὀκνήσαντες περὶ τὴν τούτων κατάληψιν, τὰ ἐγγυτέρω μᾶλλον ἑαυτῶν ἐζήτησαν. Indolence is connected with sensuality, because it does not go beyond the bodily and the visible. Comp. the subsequent part of the chapter. In the same manner *Basil M.* hexaëmeron hom. ii. p. 19, (Paris edit. 1638,) says: Οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ παρὰ Θεοῦ τὸ κακὸν τὴν γένεσιν ἔχειν εὐσεβές ἐστι λέγειν, διὰ τὸ μηδὲν τῶν ἐναντίων παρὰ τοῦ ἐναντίου γίνεσθαι, οὔτε γὰρ ἡ ζωὴ θάνατον γεννᾷ, οὔτε ὁ σκότος φωτός ἐστιν ἀρχὴ, οὔτε ἡ νόσος ὑγείας δημιουργός........τί οὖν φαμεν; ὅτι κακόν ἐστιν οὐχὶ οὐσία ζῶσα καὶ ἔμψυχος, ἀλλὰ διάθεσις ἐν ψυχῇ ἐναντίως ἔχουσα πρὸς ἀρετὴν διὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ καλοῦ ἀπόπτωσιν τοῖς ῥαθύμοις ἐγγινομένη.—*Gregory of Nyssa* orat. catechet. c. 5. (Opp. iii. p. 53): Καθάπερ γὰρ ἡ ὅρασις φύσεών ἐστιν ἐνέργεια, ἡ δὲ πήρωσις στέρησίς ἐστι τῆς φυσικῆς ἐνεργείας, οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἀρετὴ πρὸς τὴν κακίαν ἀνθέστηκεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄλλην κακίας γένεσιν ἐννοῆσαι, ἢ ἀρετῆς ἀπουσίαν. Comp. c. 6. c. 22. c. 28. and the dial. de anima et resurrectione.

(4) A more precise definition of sin is given by the theologians after the time of Augustine. Thus *Gregory* I. makes a distinction between peccatum and delictum: Peccatum est mala facere, delictum vero est bona relinquere, quæ summopere sunt tenenda. Vel certe peccatum in opere est, delictum in cogitatione, Ezech. lib. ii. hom. 9, p. 1404. He also distinguishes between peccatum et crimen; every crimen is a peccatum, but not vice versa. None is sine peccato, but many are sine crimine (Tit. i. 6, 1 Joh. i. 8.) The peccata only stain the soul, the crimina kill it, Moral. xvi. c. 12. The iniquitas, impietas, etc. are also represented as modifications of sin, Mor. xi. 42. xxii. 10. The source of all sin is pride; pride produces envy, wrath, etc. The seat of sin is both in the soul and in the body; the devil is one of the chief agents in inducing man to commit sin: comp. *Lau*, p. 379, ss.

(5) *Augustine*, however, endeavours to reconcile the mystic interpretation of paradise with the historical, de civit. Dei xiii. 21. *Gregory the Great* adopts the literal interpretation, Mor. xxxi. comp. *Lau*, p. 377, ss. The Devil tempted our first parents in a threefold manner, gula, vana gloria, and avaritia. The attack itself was fourfold, by suggestio, delectatio consensus, and defensionis audacia, Mor. iv. c. 27.

§ 108.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST SIN, AND FREEDOM OF THE WILL (ACCORDING TO THE THEOLOGIANS OF THE GREEK CHURCH.)

A. Hahn, Ephræm der Syrer über die Willensfreiheit des Menschen, nebst den Theorien derjenigen Kirchenlehrer bis zu seiner Zeit, welche hier besondere Berücksichtigung verdienen. (in Illgens Denkschrift der hist. theol. Gesellschaft zu Leipzig. Part 2, Leipz. 1819, p 30, ss.)

Even *those* theologians who kept themselves free from the influence of the Augustinian system, suppose that the sin of Adam was followed by disastrous effects upon the human race, but restricted them (as the Fathers of the preceding period had done) to the mortality of the body, the hardships and miseries of life, and sometimes admitted that the moral faculties of man had been affected by the fall. Thus *Gregory of Nazianzum* in particular (to whom Augustine appealed in preference of all others) thought that both the νοῦς and the ψυχή had been considerably impaired by the fall, and regarded the perversion of man's sentiments and its consequence, idolatry, which the writers previous to his time had ascribed to the influence of demons, as the effect of the first sin. But he was far from asserting the total depravity of mankind, and the entire loss of the free will.(1) On the contrary, the doctrine of the freedom of the will continued to be distinctly maintained by the Greek church. (2) *Athanasius* himself, commonly called the father of orthodoxy, maintained in the strongest terms that man has the ability of choosing between good and evil, and was so far from believing in the general corruption of mankind, as to look upon several individuals, who lived prior to the appearance of Christ, as righteous.(3) *Cyrill of Jerusalem* also assumed that men are born in a state of innocence, and that a free agent alone can commit sin. Similar views were entertained by *Ephraim the Syrian*, *Gregory of Nyssa, Basil the Great,* and others.(4) *Chrysostom,* whose whole tendency was of a practico-moral kind, brought the liberty of man and his moral self-determination most distinctly forward, and passed a severe censure upon those who endeavoured to excuse their own immoralities by ascribing the origin of sin to the fall of Adam.(5)

(1) Orat. xxxviii. 12, p. 670. xliv. 4, p. 837. xiv. 25, p. 275. xix. 13, p. 372. Carmen. iv. v. 98. and other passages quoted by *Ullmann,* p. 421, ss. Comp. especially the interesting parallel which is there drawn between Gregory and Augustine as well as between the expressions of the former in the original, and the (corrupt) translation of the latter. "*Gregory by no means taught the doctrines afterwards propounded by Pelagius and his followers; but if all his sentiments be duly considered, it will be found that he is far more of a Pelagian than of an Augustinian.*" Ullmann, l. c. p. 446.

(2) According to *Methodius* (in Phot. Bibl. Cod. 234, p. 295), man does not possess the power either of *having* desires, or of not having them (ἐνθυμεῖσθαι ἢ μὴ ἐνθυμεῖσθαι), but he is at liberty either to gratify (χρῆσθαι) them, or not. Comp. *Nemes.* de nat. hom. c. 41: Πᾶσα τοίνυν ἀνάγκη τόν ἔχοντα τὸ βουλεύεσθαι καὶ κύριον εἶναι πράξεων. εἰ γὰρ μὴ κύριος εἴη πράξεων, περιττῶς ἔχει τὸ βουλεύεσθαι.

(3) *Athan.* contra gent. c. 2, p. 2: Ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν οὐκ ἦν κακία, οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ νῦν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἐστὶν, οὐδ' ὅλως κατ' αὐτοὺς ὑπάρχει αὐτή. cf. contra Arian. or. 3. (4.) Opp. T. i. p. 582, 83: Πολλοὶ γὰρ οὖν ἅγιοι γεγόνασι καθαροὶ πάσης ἁμαρτίας. (He alludes to Jeremiah and John the baptist: but they cannot properly be called πολλοί.) Nevertheless death has reigned even over them, who have not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression (Rom. v. 14.)

(4) *Cyr.* Cat. iv. 19: Ἐλθόντες εἰς τόνδε τὸν κόσμον ἀναμάρτητοι, νῦν ἐκ προαιρέσεως ἁμαρτάνομεν. 21: Αὐτεξιύσιός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ, καὶ ὁ διάβολος τὸ μὲν ὑποβάλλειν δύναται· τὸ δὲ καὶ ἀναγκάσαι παρὰ παροαίρεσιν οὐκ ἔχει τὴν ἐξουσίαν. Cat. xvi. 23: Εἰ γάρ τις ἀβλεπτῶν μὴ καταξιοῦται τῆς χάριτος, μὴ μεμφέσθω τῷ πνεύμαρι, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀπιστίᾳ. (*Oudin,* Comm. p. 461—464, attempted in vain to contest the genuineness of the catecheses which are favourable to Semipelagianism.) Concerning Ephraim, see the above dissertation. *Basil the Great* delivered a discourse περὶ τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου, the au-

thenticity of which was rejected by *Garnier* (T. ii. p. xxvi.), but in modern times again defended by *Pelt* and *Rheinwald* (Homiliarium patrist. i. 2, p. 192.) Though he admitted the depravity of mankind, he asserted that human liberty and Divine grace must co-operate. Comp. also the Hom. de Spir. S. and *Klose*, l. c. p. 59, ss. *Gregory of Nyssa* also supposed a universal tendency to sin (de orat. dom. Or. v. Opp. i. p. 751, ss.), but he did not believe in the sinful state of infants; Orat. de infantibus qui præmature abripiuntur (Opp. iii. p. 317, ss.)

(5) See hom. in ep. ad Rom. xvi. p. 241; in ep. ad Hebr. hom. xii. p. 805. D; in evang. Joh. hom. xvii. p. 115 C; in i. epist. ad Cor. hom. ii. p. 514, D; in Ps. l. hom. ii. (Opp. T. iii. p. 869, D;) all of which are quoted by *Münscher* von Cölln, i. p. 363, ss. in ep. ad. Phil. hom. i. "*Chrysostom was so zealous for the promotion of true morality, that he must have considered it a point of special importance to deprive men of every ground of excuse for the neglect of moral efforts. His practical sphere of labour in the cities of Antioch and Constantinople, gave a still greater impulse to this tendency. For in these large capitals he met with many who sought to attribute their want of Christian activity to the defects of human nature, and the power of Satan or of fate.*" *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, iii. 2, p. 1369. 70. Comp. his Chrysostomus, i. p. 51, p. 283, ss. But Chrysostom urged quite as strongly the existence of depravity in opposition to a false moral pride. Hom. vi. Montf. T. 12, in *Neander*, Chrysostomus, ii. p. 36, 37. Comp. *Wiggers*, i. p. 442.

§ 109.

THE OPINIONS OF THE WESTERN THEOLOGIANS PERVIOUS TO THE TIME OF AUGUSTINE, AND OF AUGUSTINE HIMSELF PREVIOUS TO THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

During this period, as well as during the preceding, the theologians of the Western church were more favourable than those of the Eastern, to the Augustine doctrine. *Hilary* and *Ambrose* taught the propagation of sin by birth; Ambrose appealed especially to Ps. li. 5, in support of the doctrine of original sin, but without determining to what extent every individual shares in the common guilt.(1) Nevertheless, neither of them excluded the liberty of man from the work of moral reformation.(2) Thus *Augustine* himself, at an earlier period of his life, defended human freedom in opposition to the Manichæans.(3)

---

(1) *Hilar.* tract. in Ps. lviii. p. 129; in Ps. cxviii. litt. 22, p. 366. 6, and some other passages (in *Münsher* von Cölln, p. 354.) *Ambrose*, Apol. David. c. 11. Opp. i. p. 846: Antequam nascamur, maculamur contagio, et ante usuram lucis, originis ipsius excipimus injuriam; in iniquitate concipimur: non expressit utrum parentum, an nostra. Et in delictis generat unumquemque mater sua; nec hic declaravit utrum in delictis suis mater pariat an jam sint et aliqua delicta nascentis. Sed vide, ne utrumque intelligendum sit. Nec conceptus iniquitatis exsors est, quoniam et parentes non carent lapsu. Et si nec unius diei infans sine peccato est, multo magis nec illi materni conceptus dies sine peccato sunt. Concipimur ergo in peccato parentum et in delictis eorum nascimur. Sed et ipse partus habet contagia sua, nec unum tantummodo habet ipsa natura contagium. Comp. de pœnit. i. 3. Opp. 3, p. 498: Omnes homines sub peccato nascimur, quorum ipse ortus in vitio est, sicut habes lectum, dicente David: *Ecce enim in iniquitatibus conceptus sum et in delictis peperit me mater mea.*—In Ev. Luke i. 17. Opp. i. p. 737. Epp. Class. ii. Opp. iii. p. 1190, and some other passages (in *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 355.)

(2) *Hilar.* Tract in Psalm cxviii. lit. 15, p. 329: Est quidem in fide *manendi* a Deo munus, *sed incipiendi a nobis origo est.* Et voluntas nostra hoc proprium ex se habere debet, ut velit. Deus incipienti incrementum dabit, quia consummationem per se infirmitas nostra non obtinet, meritum tamen adipiscendæ consummationis est ex initio voluntatis.

(3) De gen. contra Manich. ii. 43, (c. 29): Nos dicimus nulli naturæ nocere peccata nisi sua; nos dicimus, nullum malum esse naturali, sed omnes naturas bonas esse.—De lib. arb. iii. 50, (c. 17): Aut enim et ipsa voluntas est et a radice ista voluntatis non receditur, aut non est voluntas, et peccatum nullum habet. Aut igitur ipsa voluntas est prima causa peccandi, aut nullum peccatum est prima causa peccandi. Non est, cui recte imputetur peccatum, nisi peccanti. Non est ergo, cui recte imputetur,

nisi volenti....Quæcunque ista causa est voluntatis: si non ei potest resisti, sine peccato ei ceditur; si autem potest, non ei cedatur et non peccabitur. An forte *fallit* incautum? Ergo caveat ne fallatur. An tanta fallacia est ut caveri omnino non possit? si ita est, nulla peccata sunt: quis enim peccat in eo quod nullo modo caveri potest? Peccatur autem; caveri igitur potest. Comp. de duab. animab. contra Manich. 12, and with it the retractationes of the different passages; also de nat. et grat. 80, (c. 67.)

§ 110.

THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

* *Wiggers, G. F.*, Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus, Berlin 1821. Hamburgh, 1833, ii. 8. †*Lentzen, J. A.*, de Pelagianorum doctrinæ principiis, Colon. ad Rhen. 1833. 8. *J. L. Jacobi*, die Lehre des Pelagius, Lpz. 1842.

Towards the commencement of the fifth century *Celestius* and *Pelagius* (Brito, Morgan?) made their appearance in the West.(1) The views by which they were induced to deny the natural depravity of man, were partly in accordance with the opinions hitherto entertained by the theologians of the Greek church, but partly carried to a much greater length. Some of the propositions on the ground of which the presbyter *Paulinus* accused Celestius at the synod of Carthage (A. D. 412), had been previously defended by orthodox theologians; others were directly opposed both to the doctrine of Scripture (and especially that of Paul), and the general belief of the church, and thus threatened the fundamental doctrines of the gospel.(2) It is, however, difficult to decide how far the views of Pelagius accorded with these assertions, since he expressed himself very cautiously.(3) But it is certain that what is commonly called *Pelagianism* does not so much represent single notions of a single individual, as a complete *moral and religious system*, which formed a decided contrast to *Augustinism*. The former was in so far overcome by the latter, as in consequence of the turn which the controversy took, and of the great authority of *Augustine* in the West, his doctrine gained the victory over that of *Pelagius.* (4) The followers of Pelagius formed not a sect properly so called. But Pelagianism, though condemned, lost none of its advocates, especially as but few could fully enter into all the consequences of the Augustinian system, and find in them real inward satisfaction. It will be necessary, in order to examine more fully the subject before us, to divide the subject matter of controversy into three leading sections, viz. 1. Sin; 2. Grace and Liberty; and, 3. Predestination.

(1) On the personal character and history of Celestius and Pelagius, see *Wiggers*, p. 33, ss.

(2) The 6 or 7 capitula (the numbers vary according as the several propositions are separated, or joined together) are preserved by *Augustine* de gestis Pelagii, cap. 11, (comp. de peccato originali, 2, 3, 4, 11, c. 2–10), as well as in the two commonitoria of *Marius Mercator*, [comp. *Gieseler*, § 87, note 4.] They are the following (comp. *Wiggers*, i. p. 60):

1. Adam was created mortal, so that he would have died, whether he had sinned or not;
2. Adam's sin has only affected himself, and not the human race;
3. New-born infants are in the same condition in which Adam was previous to the fall (ante prævaricationem);
4. The whole human race dies neither in consequence of Adam's death, nor of his transgression; nor does it rise from the dead in consequence of Christ's resurrection;
5. Infants obtain eternal life, though they should not be baptized;
6. The law is as good a means of salvation (lex sic mittit ad regnum cœlorum), as the gospel;
7. There were some men, even before the appearance of Christ, who did not commit sin.

If we compare these propositions with the doctrines of the earlier theologians, we find, that the third was held by some of the Greek Fathers (*e. g.* Theophilus of Antioch, and Clement of

Alexandria, see above, § 62, note 1); that the fifth was substantially the same with that defended by Gregory of Nazianzum and others, viz. that unbaptized children are not condemned on account of their not being baptized (comp. § 72); and that even the seventh, however heterodox it may appear, does not stand quite alone, inasmuch as the father of orthodoxy himself made a similar assertion (§ 108, note 3.) On the other hand, the first two and the fourth propositions, in which all connection betwen the sin of Adam and that of his posterity, and its effects even in relation to the mortality of the body, are denied, would have been condemned by the earlier theologians. But none appears so heretical, so much opposed to the doctrine of Paul and the Gospel, as the sixth. And, lastly, the denial of the connection subsisting between the resurrection of Christ and ours (in the fourth proposition), must have offended those who believed in the union of Christians with Christ; it may, however, be asked, whether some of these extreme views are more than the consequences which Celestius was compelled to infer from his premises by the opposition he met with? See *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 3, p. 1219.

(3) *Augustine* perceives no other difference between Pelagius and Celestius (de pecc. orig. c. 12.) than that the latter was more open, the former more guarded, the latter more obstinate, the former more deceitful, or, to say the least, that the latter was more straight-forward (liberior) the former more cunning (astutior.) *Prosper of Aquitania* calls him therefore coluber Britannus (in his poem de ingratis, append. 67.—comp. *Wiggers*, p. 40.)—*Neander*, (Chrysostomus, vol. ii. p. 134.) judges more mildly of him: "*Pelagius is deserving of our esteem on account of his honest zeal for the promotion of morality; his object was to combat the same perverse antichristian tendency which Augustine opposed. But he was wrong in the manner in which he sought to attain his object,*" etc. Comp. Kirchengeschichte, ii. 3, p. 1195, ss. "*For aught we know from his writings, he was a clear-headed, intelligent man, who possessed far more of a serious and moral turn of mind, than of that disposition which finds itself compelled to dive into the depths of the mind and of the spirit, and to bring to light hidden things,*" p. 1199.

(4) THE PRINCIPAL POINTS IN THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSY ARE: The condemnation of the doctrine of Pela-

gius at Carthage A. D. 412. He repairs to Palestine, where *Jerome* becomes one of his most zealous opponents, and, conjointly with *Paulus Orosius*, a disciple of Augustine, accuses him at a synod held at Jerusalem (A. D. 415.) under *John*, bishop of Jerusalem. John, however, did not pronounce his condemnation, but reported the whole matter to Innocent, bishop of Rome.—Synod at Diospolis (Lydda), under *Eulogius* of Cæsarea. The plaintiffs were *Heros* of Arles, and *Lazarus* of Aix. Acquittal of Pelagius. Dissatisfaction of Jerome with the decisions of this synod (Synodus miserabilis!)—Under *Zosimus*, the successor of Innocent, Pelagius and Celestius entertain new hopes.—Synod of the North-African bishops at Carthage A. D. 418, and condemnation of Pelagius.—The Emperor Honorius decides the controversy.—Zosimus is induced to change his views, and publishes his Epistola tractoria, in which the Pelagian doctrine is condemned. *Julian*, bishop of Eclanum in Apulia, undertakes to defend Pelagianism (respecting him see *Wiggers*, i. p. 43, ss.) —He was anathematized at the synod of Ephesus (A. D. 431.), in connection with Nestorius (was it merely accidental that they were condemned in common?) Still the system of Augustine was not recognized in the East.

§ 111.

FIRST POINT OF CONTROVERSY.

Sin.—Original Sin and its Consequences.

[*Payne, G.*, The doctrine of Original Sin. Lond. 1846. Lect. V. *Knapp*, l. c. p. 404, ss.]

Pelagius, from a speculative, and especially ethical point of view, regarded every human being as a moral agent who is complete in himself, and separate from all others. Hence sin would necessarily appear to him as the free act of the individual, and, in his opinion, there could be no other connection between the sin of the one (Adam), and the sin of the many (his posterity), than that which exists between the example, on the one hand, and voluntary imitation on the other. Every infant is accordingly in the same condition in which Adam was prior to the fall. Neither sin nor virtue is inherent, but the one, as well as the other, developes itself, when man comes to make use of his liberty, for which he himself is alone responsible.(1) *Augustine,* on the contrary, resting his system on more profound conceptions, which, however, might easily prevent a clear insight into the moral relations of man, considered the human race as a concrete totality. With a predominant bias towards religion, he directed his attention more to the inner and permanent state of the soul, and its absolute relation to God, than to the passing and external action of the individual. This tendency, as well as the experience of his own heart and life, led him to suppose a mysterious connection subsisting between the transgression of Adam, and the sin of all men—a connection which loses itself in the dim beginnings of nature no less than of history. Mere suppositions, however, did not satisfy his mind; but, carrying out his system in all its logical consequences, and applying a false exegesis to certain passages, he laid down the following rigid proposition as his doctrine: "*As all men have sinned in Adam, they are justly exposed to the vengeance of God because of this hereditary sin and guilt of sin.*"(2)

---

(1) *Pelag.* lib. 1. de lib. arb. in Aug. de pecc. orig. c. 13: Omne bonum ac malum, quo vel laudabiles, vel vituperabiles sumus, non nobiscum *oritur,* sed *agitur* a nobis: *capaces* enim utriusque rei, non *pleni* nascimur, et ut sine virtute ita et sine vitio procreamur, atque ante actionem propriæ voluntatis id solum in homine est, quod Deus condidit; he even admits the preponderance of *good* in man, when he (according to August. de nat. et gr. c. 21,) speaks of a *naturalis quædam sanctitas,* which dwells in man, and keeps watch in the castle of the soul over good and evil, and by which he means *conscience.* Comp. *Julian* (quoted by August. in Op. imp. i. 105): Illud quod esse peccatum ratio demonstrat, inveniri nequit in seminibus. 122: Nemo naturaliter malus est: sed quicunque reus est, moribus, non exordiis accusatur. Other

passages will be found in *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 375, ss. Comp. Wiggers, p. 91, ss. Augustine himself protested against the expression peccatum naturæ, or peccatum naturale, which the Pelagians imputed to him, and always returned to the use of the phrase peccatum originale. The Pelagians considered bodily death not as the effect of the first sin, but as a physical necessity, though Pelagius himself conceded at the synod of Diospolis, that the death of Adam was a punishment inflicted upon him, but only upon *him*. Aug. de nat. et gr. 21, (c. 19.) Op. imp. i. 67 ; vi. 27, 30.

(2) A list of the works in which Augustine combated the Pelagians, will be found in *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 373. The passages bearing on this question, which can be understood, however, only in their own connection, are also given there, p. 377, ss. (Comp. de Pecc. mer. i. 2, 4, 21 ; opus imp. vi. 30 ; de pecc. mer. i. 10 ; de nupt. et concup. i. 27, ii. 57–59 ; op. imp. i. 47 ; de nupt. et concup. i. 26 ; de pecc. orig. 36 ; de con. et grat. 28. In support of his views he appealed to infant baptism : de pecc. mer. i. 39, iii. 7 ; contra Jul. vi. 6 ; de pecc. mer. i. 21 ; enchirid. 93 ; to the formulas of exorcism : de pecc. orig. 45 ; and principally to Rom. v. 12.) Wiggers, p. 99, ss. On *Augustine's* interpretation of Rom. v. 12, (*in quo* omnes peccaverunt, Vulg.) see Op. imp. ii. 47, ss., 66, contra duas Epp. Pel. iv. 7, (c. 4;) Julian, on the other hand, gives the following explanation : *in quo* omnes peccaverunt nihil aliud indicat, quam : quia omnes peccaverunt. Augustine's exposition was confirmed by the synod of Carthage (A. D. 418.) Comp. *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 381, 382. But it would be a great mistake to ascribe the whole theory of Augustine to this exegetical error : very different causes gave rise to that theory, viz. 1. His own disposition, moulded by the remarkable events in the history of his external and internal life ; 2. Perhaps some remnants of his former Manichæan notions, of which he might be unconscious himself, *e. g.* that of the defiling element of the concupiscentia, libido in the act of generation ; 3. His realistic mode of thinking, which led him to confound the abstract with the concrete, and to consider the individual as a transitory and perishing part of the whole (massa perditionis.) In connection with this mode of thinking another cause might be, 4. his notions of the church as a living organism, and of the effects of infant baptism ; 5. the opposition which he was compelled to make to Pelagianism, which threat-

ened to destroy the true nature of Christianity.—Thus, according to Augustine, not only was physical death a punishment inflicted upon Adam and all his posterity, but he looked upon *original sin itself as being in some sense a punishment of the first transgression*, though it was also a real sin (God punishes sin by sin), and can therefore be imputed to every individual. But it is on this very point, viz. the imputation of original sin, that his views differed from all former opinions, however strict they were. He endeavoured to clear himself from the charge of Manichæism (in opposition to Julian) by designating sin not a substance, but a vitium, a languor; he even charged his opponent with Manichæism.—Respecting his views of the insignificant remnant (lineamenta extrema) of the Divine image left in man, and of the virtues of pagans, see *Wiggers*, p. 119, note.

§ 112.

SECOND POINT OF CONTROVERSY.

Liberty and Grace.

Pelagius admitted, that man in his moral efforts stands in need of the Divine aid, and therefore spoke of the *grace of God* as assisting the imperfections of man by a variety of means.(1) He supposed, however, that this grace of God is something external, and added to the efforts put forth by the free will of man; it must even be deserved by virtuous inclinations.(2) *Augustine*, on the other hand, looked upon it as the creative principle of life, which produces out of itself the liberty of the will, which is entirely lost in the natural man. In the power of the natural man to choose between good and evil, to which great importance was attached by Pelagius, as well as by the earlier church, he saw only a liberty to do evil, since the regenerate man alone can will good.(3)

(1) Concerning this point *Pelagius* expresses himself as follows (in August. de grat. c. 5): Primo loco posse statuimus, secundo velle, tertio esse. Posse in natura, velle in arbitrio, esse in effectu locamus. Primum illud, *i. e.* posse, ad Deum proprie

pertinet, qui illud creaturæ suæ contulit; duo vero reliqua, h. e. velle et esse, ad hominem referenda sunt, quia de arbitrii fonte descendunt. Ergo in voluntate et opere laus hominis est, immo et hominis et Dei, qui *ipsius* voluntatis et operis possibilitatem dedit, quique ipsam possibilitatem gratiæ suæ adjuvat semper annilio. Quod vero *potest* homo velle bonum atque perficere, solius Dei est. Hence man also owes to God, that he *can* will, c. 18: Habemus autem possibilitatem a Deo insitam, velut quandam, ut ita dicam, radicem fructiferam atque fecundum, etc. The freedom of the will is common to Jews, Gentiles, and Christians; *grace,* according to Pelagius himself, belongs exclusively to Christianity. Pelagius also rejected the proposition of Celestius, " gratiam Dei non ad singulos actus dari." [*Münscher* von Cölln, i. p. 386.]

(2) Pelagius considered as means of grace especially the *doctrine* (as the manifestation of the Divine will), the promises, and trials (to which belong the wiles of Satan); but *Julian* strongly denied, that the will of man is thus created by them (fabricetur, condatur); he sees in them nothing but an adjutorium of the undisturbed free will. Comp. Aug. de grat. Chr. c. 8. Op. imp. i. 94, 95. [*Münscher*, l. c. p. 387, 88.]

(3) *Augustine*, on the contrary, maintains: Non lege atque doctrina insonante forinsecus, sed interna et occulta, mirabili ac ineffabili potestate operari Deum in cordibus hominum non solum veras revelationes, sed bonas etiam voluntates (de grat. Chr. 24.) He recognizes in the grace of God an inspiratio dilectionis, and considers it as the source of every thing. Nolentem prævenit, ut velit, volentem subsequitur, ne frustra velit (Enchir. c. 32.)— He understands by freedom to be free from sin, that state of mind in which it is no longer necessary to choose between good and evil. The same view is expressed in his treatise de civit. Dei xiv. 11, which was not a controversial writing: Arbitrium igitur voluntatis tunc est vere liberum, cum vitiis peccatisque non servit. Tale datum est a Deo: quod amissum proprio vitio, nisi a quo pari potuit, reddi non potest. Unde Veritas dicit: *Si vos Filius liberavit, tunc vere liberi eritis.* Idque ipsum est autem, ac si diceret: si vos Filius salvos fecerit, tunc vere salvi eritis. Inde quippe liberator, unde salvator. Comp. contra duas epp. Pel. i. 2. The freedom of the will is greater in proportion as the will itself is in a state of health; its state of health depends on its subjection to the Divine mercy and grace. Contra

Jul. c. 8, he calls the human will servum propriæ voluntatis arbitrium.—Such expressions were so much misused by the monks of Adrumetum (about the year 426), that Augustine himself was compelled to oppose them (especially in his treatise de correptione de gratia); on the whole, he himself frequently appealed from a practical point of view to the will of man (see the next §.) [For a more detailed statement of Augustine's views respecting grace and the freedom of the will, see *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. § 93, and p. 388–398, where further passages are quoted.]

§ 113.

THIRD POINT OF CONTROVERSY.

Predestination.

We have already seen that *Augustine* held the doctrine of hereditary depravity, the guilt of which man has himself incurred, and from which no human power, nor human volition can deliver, but those alone will be saved to whom the grace of God is imparted. From these premises it would necessarily follow, that God, in consequence of an eternal decree, and without any reference to the future conduct of man, has elected some out of the corrupt mass to become vessels of his mercy (vasa misericordiæ,) and left the rest as vessels of his wrath (vasa iræ,) to bear the just consequences of their sins. Augustine called the former *predestinatio*, the latter *reprobatio*, and thus evaded the necessity of directly asserting the doctrine of a predestination to evil (prædestinatio duplex.)⁽¹⁾ On the whole, he endeavoured to soften the harshness of his theory by practical cautions.⁽²⁾ But the doctrine in question became to many a stone of stumbling, which orthodox theologians themselves (especially those of the Greek church) endeavoured by every possible means to remove.⁽³⁾ This prepared the way for those vague and unfounded schemes to which *Semipelagianism* (see the following section) gave rise.

(1) De Præd. Sanctorum 37 (c. 18): Elegit nos Deus in Christo ante mundi constitutionem, prædestinans nos in adoptionem filiorum: non quia per nos sancti et immaculati futuri eramus, sed elegit prædestinavitque, ut essemus. Fecit autem hoc secundum placitum voluntatis suæ, ut nemo de sua, sed de illius erga se voluntate glorietur, etc. In support of his views he appealed to Eph. i. 4. 11. and Rom. ix., and spoke of a *certus numerus electorum, neque augendus, neque minuendus,* de corrept. et gr. 39, (c. 13.)—He refutes the objections of the understanding by quoting Rom. ix. 20, and adducing examples from sacred history. Even in *this* life worldly goods, health, beauty, physical and intellectual powers, are distributed unequally, and not always in accordance with our views of merit, ibid. 19, c. 8. Christ himself was predestinated to be the Son of God, de pred. 31, (c. 15.)

(2) De dono persev. 57, (c. 22): Prædestinatio non ita populis prædicanda est, ut apud imperitam vel tardioris intelligentiæ multitudinem redargui quodammodo ipsa sua prædicatione videatur; sicut redargui videtur et præscientia Dei (quam certe negare non possunt) si dicatur hominibus: "Sive curatis, sive dormiatis, quod vos præscivit qui falli non potest, hoc eritis." Dolosi autem vel imperiti medici est, etiam utile medicamentum sic alligare, ut aut non prosit, aut obsit. Sed dicendum est: "Sic currite, ut comprehendatis, atque ut ipso cursu vestro ita vos esse præcognitos noveritis, ut legitime curreretis," et si quo alio modo Dei præscientia prædicari potest, ut hominis segnitia repellatur. 59:...*de ipso autem cursu vestro bono rectoque condiscite vos ad prædestinationem divinæ gratiæ pertinere.*

(3) Notwithstanding the condemnation of Pelagius at the synod of Ephesus, the system of Augustine did not exert any influence upon the theology of the eastern church. *Theodore of Mopsuestia* wrote (against the advocates of Augustinism): πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας φύσει καὶ οὐ γνώμη πταίειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους 5 books (Photii Bibl. Cod. 177, some Latin fragments of which are preserved by Mar. Mercator ed. Baluz.) *Fritzsche*, p. 107, ss. (on the question whether it was directed against Jerome, or against Augustine? see *Fritzsche*, l. c. p. 109, and *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, ii. p. 1360, 61.) *Theodoret*, *Chrysostom*, *Isidore of Pelusium*, and others continued to follow the earlier course of dogmatic theology. See the passages in *Münscher* von Cölln, i. p. 408–10. and comp. § 108.

§ 114.

SEMIPELAGIANISM AND THE LATER FATHERS OF THE CHURCH.

Geffken, J., historia Semipelagianismi antiquissima, Gött. 1826. 4. *Wiggers*, de Joh. Cassiano Massiliensi, qui Semipelagianismi auctor vulgo perhibetur. Commentt. ii. Rost. 1824. 25. 4; *by the same:* Versuch einer pragmat. Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus. Vol. ii. *Neander*, Denkwürdigkeiten, vol. iii. p. 92, ss.

In opposition both to the extreme Augustinians (Predestinarians,)(1) and to Augustinism itself, a new system developed itself, upon which Monachism undoubtedly exerted a considerable influence, as its very principles are essentially Pelagian, but which owed its origin likewise to a more healthy practico-moral tendency. Its advocates endeavoured to pursue a middle course between the two extremes, viz. Pelagianism and Augustinism, and to satisfy the moral, as well as the religious wants of the age, by the partial adoption of the premises of both systems, without carrying them out in all their logical consequences.(2) The leader of the Gallican theologians (Massilienses) who propounded this new system, afterwards called *Semipelagianism*, was *John Cassian*, a disciple of Chrysostom,(3) whom *Prosper of Aquitania* and others combated.(4) He was followed by *Faustus, bishop of Rhegium,*(5) who gained the victory over *Lucidus*, a Hyper-Augustinian presbyter, at the *Synod of Arles* (A. D. 472.) For the space of some 30 or 40 years Semipelagianism continued to be the prevailing form of doctrine in Gaul,(6) till it met with new opposition on the part of *Avitus of Vienne,*(7) *Cesar of Arelate,*(8) *Fulgentius of Ruspe*(9) and others. After a variety of proceedings Augustinism gained a firm footing even in Gaul, by means of the Synods of *Arausio* (Orange) and *Valence* (A. D. 529), but with the important restriction that the doctrine of predestination to evil was not adopted.(10) Boniface II., bishop of Rome, in accordance with the measures adopted by his predecessors, confirmed these decisions (A. D. 530.)(11) "*Gregory the Great transmitted to subsequent ages the milder aspect of the Augustinian doctrine, which has regard to practical Christianity rather than to speculation.*"(12)

(1) In speaking of Predestinarians, we might refer to the monks of Adrumetum in the province of Byzacene, in North Africa, and to Lucidus, mentioned below, who taught the doctrine of a prædestinatio duplex, but it is satisfactorily proved, that (historically) "*a sect, or even a separate party of Predestinarians who dissented from Augustine never existed*" (as was formerly erroneously supposed.) Comp. *Wiggers*, ii. p. 329, ss. 347. This error was spread by *J. Sirmond*, historia prædestinatiana, Opp. T. iv. p. 267, ss), and the work edited by him under the title Prædestinatus, in which the prædest. hæresis is mentioned as the ninetieth in the order of heresies (reprinted in *Gallandi* Bibl. x.) Comp. also *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereien v. p. 218, ss. *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 3, p. 1339, ss. (*Gieseler*, i. § 113, notes 4. 9–11.)

(2) According to the reports made by *Prosper* and *Hilary*, scil. Prosperi (428. 29), to Augustine (in *Wiggers*, p. 153. *Münscher*, ed. by Von Cölln, i. p. 411,) the treatise of Augustine, entitled de correptione et gratia, had excited some commotion among the Gallican theologians and monks, in consequence of which he wrote the further treatises de præd. sanctorum, and de dono perseverantiæ. Though these Gallican theologians differed in some particulars from Cassian (see *Wiggers*, p. 181), yet there was a considerable agreement between their doctrine and his. Comp. also *Neander*, p. 1513, ss.

(3) Comp. above § 82, note 21. Of his collationes the thirteenth is the most important. Prosper complains of his syncretism, contra collatorem, c. 5: Illi (Pelagiani) in omnibus justis hominum operibus liberæ voluntatis tuentur exordia, nos bonarum cogitationum ex Deo semper credimus prodire principia, tu *informe* nescio quid *tertium* reperisti.—This *tertium* consisted in the following particulars: *a*. Cassian, who detested the profana opinio and impietas Pelagii, (see *Wiggers*, ii. p. 19, 20.) regarded the natural man neither as morally healthy (as Pelagius did), nor as morally dead (like Augustine), but as diseased

and morally weakened (dubitari non potest inesse quidem omnia animæ naturaliter virtutum semina beneficio creatoris inserta, sed nisi hæc opitulatione Dei fuerint excitata, ad incrementum perfectionis non poterunt pervenire, Coll. xiii. 12.) *b.* He insisted so much more than Pelagius on the necessity and spiritual nature of Divine grace (Coll. xiii. 3), that he even ventured to assert, that men are sometimes drawn to salvation against their will (nonnunquam etiam inviti trahimur ad salutem, comp. Coll. xii. 18. *Wiggers*, p. 85.) But in opposition to Augustine he restricted only to a few (*e. g.* Matthew and Paul), what the latter would extend to all, and appealed to the example of Zaccheus, Cornelius the centurion, the thief on the cross, and others, in proof of his opinion. In general, he ascribed the ascensus to God, as well as the descensus to earthly things to the free will of man, and looked upon grace as rather *cooperans*, though he does not express himself very distinctly. Only we must take care not to refer all the merits of the saints to God, so as to leave to human nature nothing but what is bad. *c.* He understood the atonement of Christ in a more general sense, and thus rejected the doctrine of predestination (in the sense of Augustine and the Hyper-Augustinians.) The assertion that God would save only a few, appeared to him an ingens sacrilegium (Coll. xiii. 7.) An outline of his complete system is given by *Wiggers*, p. 47–136.

(4) *Augustine* himself combated Semipelagianism in the above works. *Wiggers* gives a sketch of the controversy between Prosper on the one hand, and Cassian and the Semipelagians on the other, p. 136, ss.

(5) *Faustus* first presided over the monastery of Lerinum, which was for some time the chief seat of Semipelagianism. On *Vincentius Lerinensis* comp. *Wiggers*, p. 208, ss.; on Faustus and his doctrine, ibid. p. 224, ss. 235, ss. Respecting the doctrine of original sin the views of Faustus come nearer to Augustine's opinions than those of Cassian; on the other hand, his ideas of the nature of grace are less spiritual than those of the latter; comp. *Wiggers*, p. 287.—But he bestows more attention upon the doctrine of predestination. He decidedly rejects the doctrine of unconditional election by making a difference between predetermination and foreknowledge, the former of which is independent of the latter; de grat. et lib. arbitrio i. *Wiggers*, p. 279, ss. Faustus uses *e. g.* the following arguments which

savour strongly of anthropomorphism: When I accidentally cast my eyes upon a vicious action, it does not follow that I am guilty of it, because I have seen it. Thus God foresees adultery, without exciting man to impurity; he foresees murder, without exciting in man the desire for its commission, etc. *Wiggers*, p. 282, 83. In speaking of the doctrine of unconditional predestination, as propounded by his opponent Lucidus, he used the strongest terms: lex fatalis, decretum fatale, fatalis constitutio, originalis definitio vel fatalis, and looked upon it as something heathenish; *Wiggers*, p. 315. He believed in universal atonement.

(6) Comp. Gennadius Massiliensis and Ennodius Ticinensis, in *Wiggers*, p. 350, ss. A summary view of the Semipelagian doctrine in general, and its relation to both Augustinism and Pelagianism is given in the form of a table by *Wiggers*, p. 359–64.

(7) *Wiggers*, p. 368.

(8) *Wiggers*, p. 369, concerning his book: de gratia et lib. arbitrio.

(9) *Wiggers*, p. 369, ss. *Fulgentius*, carrying the doctrine of imputation still farther than Augustine, consigned to everlasting fire not only those infants that died without being baptized, but also the immature fœtus; de fide ad Petrum, c. 30, quoted by *Wiggers*, p. 376. But in reference to predestination, he endeavoured carefully to avoid all exaggerations which might give offence to Christian feelings (*Neander*, Kirchengesch. p. 1354.) After the interference of the Scythian monks he expressly blamed those who asserted the doctrine of predestination to evil, though he maintained himself a prædest. duplex (although in a different sense;) *Neander*, l. c. p. 1357. Grace is in his opinion præveniens, as well as comitans and subsequens. (Ep. ad Theodorum de conversione a seculo, quoted by *Wiggers*, p. 386.)

(10) *Mansi*, T. viii. p. 711, ss. Aug. Opp. T. x. part ii. Append. p. 157, ss. *Wiggers*, p. 430. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 417. The conclusion is the most important part: Aliquos vero ad malum divina potestate prædestinatos esse non solum non credimus, sed etiamsi sunt qui tantum malum credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathema dicimus. On the synod of Valence, see *Mansi* viii. 723, ss. App. p. 162.

(11) Among the earlier popes *Celestine* and *Gelasius* I. condemned Semipelagianism: *Hormisdas*, on the contrary, pro-

nounced a very mild judgment in opposition to the Scythian monks, without however denying the doctrine of Augustine. See Bonifacii II. Epist. ad Cæsarium given by *Mansi*, T. viii. p. 735, and App. 161, ss.

(12) Comp. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. iii. p. 287. *Wiggers*, de Gregorio M. ejusque placitis anthropologicis, Rost. 1838. *Lau*, p. 379, ss. The views of *Gregory* are most fully developed in Mor. iv. c. 24; comp. xv. c. 15. 51; ix. c. 21. 34, and many other passages. Along with strict Augustinism, we find in his writings semipelagian modifications. For his views respecting the doctrine of grace, see Mor. xx. 4; hom. in Ezech. i. 5. *Lau*, p. 403, ss. He also distinguishes between gratia præveniens and subsequens. The former is operans, but at the same time cooperans. The gratia subsequens is a means: ne inaniter velimus, sed possimus implere. See Mor. xxii. c. 9: Sancti viri sciunt, post primi parentis lapsum de corruptibili stirpe se editos, et non virtute propria, sed præveniente gratia superna ad meliore se vota et opera commutatos: et quidquid sibi mali inesse conspiciunt, de mortali propagine sentiunt meritum; quidquid vero in se boni inspiciunt, immortalis gratiæ cognoscunt donum, eique de accepto numere debitores fiant, qui et præveniendo dedit iis bonum velle quod voluerunt, et subsequendo concessit bonum esse, quod volunt. Gregory further maintains, that grace can be lost, Mor. xxv. 8. (we know what we are, but we do not know what we shall be); while, on the one hand, he appears to assert the irresistibility of grace, (Mor. ix. 9: sicut nemo obstitit largitati vocantis, ita nullus obviat justitiæ relinquentis); on the other, he says, that the humble will accept, the proud reject the gift of God, (Mor. xxx. 1; evang. lib. ii. hom. 22.) comp. *Lau*, p. 410, 411.

It is worthy of notice, that in this protracted controversy the objective aspect of anthropology was far more developed than the subjective. The doctrine of the economy of redemption still remains in an imperfect state, as may be seen *e. g.* from the indefinite manner in which the terms justificare and justificatio (= justum facere, see *Wiggers*, p. 380) were used, and from the want of proper definitions of the nature of faith. *Wiggers* therefore justly closes his account of this controversy by saying: "*A more profound examination of the nature of faith would even then have given a very different appearance to Christian anthropology.*" It should further be observed, that the Augustinian doctrine of predestination rested on his views of original sin. Adam was free *before* the fall, and predestination accordingly had no power over him, though God *foreknew* his transgression (Aug. de civ. Dei xii. 21.) Later theologians extended predestination even to Adam, and thus completed the doctrine of predestination in a speculative point of view The Reformation finished the work which Augustine left incomplete; the *Lutherans*, by developing the doctrine of faith and justification, the *Calvinists*, by developing that of absolute predestination. On the other hand, the Roman catholic church either placed itself in opposition to its own Father (the council of Trent and the Jesuits), or did not go beyond the doctrine propounded by him (the Jansenists.)

SECOND CLASS.

ECCLESIASTICAL DOCTRINES WHICH HAVE EITHER NO CONNECTION, OR BUT A REMOTE ONE, WITH THE HERESIES OF THE AGE.

§ 115.

The opinions respecting fundamental doctrines which had been matured by controversy, exerted more or less influence upon the developement of others. Thus the further theological definitions respecting the nature and attributes of God, creation, etc., are moulded by the views on the Trinity; those which relate to the atonement of Christ, and the significance of the Lord's Supper, stand in connection with the notions concerning the nature of Christ; those respecting baptism and the sacraments as means of grace, are connected with anthropological definitions; and, lastly, the developement of eschatology is influenced by all the other doctrines together. Even the more general definitions concerning the nature of Christianity, the Canon and its relation to tradition, etc., are in some way or other connected with certain fundamental principles.

Nevertheless we are justified in treating of these doctrines separately, inasmuch as in some respects at least, they are not affected by the contests, and present themselves rather as a continuation of former definitions.

§ 116.

THE IDEA OF RELIGION AND REVELATION.

Though the theologians of the present period did not believe in the possibility of an abstract religion, as distinct from its positive manifestation, yet we meet in the writings of *Lactantius* with a more precise definition of the word, *religion*, which was borrowed from the Latin. He applies the term in question not only to the external form of worship (as Tertullian had done before him), but to the union and fellowship of men with God, which he regards as an affair purely human.(1) Faith in revelation was required as a necessary condition.(2)

---

(1) Lact. Inst. iv. 28: Hac enim conditione gignimur, ut generanti nos Deo justa et debita obsequia præbeamus, hunc solum noverimus, hunc sequamur. *Hoc vinculo pietatis obstricti Deo et religati sumus, unde ipsa religio nomen accepit, non, ut Cicero interpretatus est, a relegendo.* Comp. iii. 10: Summum igitur bonum hominis in sola religione est; nam cætera, etiam quæ putantur esse homini propria, in ceteris quoque animalibus reperiuntur. 11; Constat igitur totius humani generis consensu, religionem suscipi oportere. He compared it with *sapientia* (iv. 4,) from which it is not to be separated. By sapientia he understands the knowledge, by religio the worship of God. God is the source of both. The one without the other leads to such errors, as paganism represents on the one hand in the unbelieving philosophers (the apostate and disinherited sons), and, on the other, in the superstitious multitudes (the run away slaves.)—*Augustine* follows the terminology of Tertullian; he opposes religion to fides or pietas, de pecc. mer. et rem. ii. 2. see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, ii. p. 751, and comp. *Nitzsch*, über den Religionsbegriff der Alten, theologische Studien und Kritiken, i. 3, 4.—Concerning the *nature* of religion, and the question whether it principally consists in *knowledge*, or in the *form of worship?* or whether it consists in spiritual fellowship with

God, see the controversy between Eunomius and his opponents in § 125, and *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte, ii. 2, p. 857.

(2) On the necessity of *faith* in revelation in general, see *Rufini* expos. fide (in Fell's edition of Cypr.) p. 18: Ut ergo intelligentiæ tibi aditus patescat, recte primo omnium te credere profiteris; quia nec navem quis ingreditur et liquido ac profundo vitam committit elemento, nisi se prius credat posse salvari, nec agricola semina sulcis obruit et fruges spargit in terram, nisi crediderit venturos imbres, affuturum quoque solis teporem, quibus terra confota segetem multiplicata fruge producat ac ventis spirantibus nutriat. Nihil denique est, quod in vita geri possit, si non credulitas ante præcesserit. Quid ergo mirum si accedentes ad Deum credere nos primo omnium profitemur, cum sine hoc nec ipsa exigi possit vita communis? Hoc autem idcirco in principiis præmisimus, quia pagani nobis objicere solent, quod religio nostra, quia quasi rationibus deficit, in sola credendi persuasione consistat. cf. *Aug.* de utilitate credendi, c. 13: Recte igitur catholicæ disciplinæ majestate institutum est, ut accedentibus ad religionem fides persuadeatur ante omnia. *He* too shows, that without faith there can be no friendship even among men (c. 10), no filial love and piety. Augustine knows of no other religion than positive Christianity, and insists that reason should submit to it; for *faith* precedes the knowledge of reason, l. c. c. 14; Deinde fateor, me jam Christo credidisse et in animum induxisse, id esse verum quod ille dixerit, etiamsi nulla ratione fulciatur. Reason would never have saved man from darkness and misery, nisi summus Deus *populari quadam clementia* divini intellectus auctoritatem usque ad ipsum corpus humanum declinaret atque submitteret, cujus non solum *præceptis*, sed etiam *factis* excitate animæ redire in semetipsas et respicere patriam etiam sine disputationum concertatione potuissent......Mihi autem certum est, nusquam prorsus a Christi auctoritate discedere, non enim reperio valentiorem, contra Academ. l. iii. c. 19. 20. Comp. de vera rel. c. 5; de moribus eccles. cath. c. 7: Quare deinceps nemo ex me quærat sententiam meam, sed potius audiamus oracula nostrasque ratiunculas divinis submittamus affatibus. (We cannot but acknowledge that Augustine was the most ingenious and eloquent advocate of Supranaturalism in its opposition to Rationalism.)

1. *Prolegomena.*

§ 117.

APOLOGETICAL WRITINGS IN DEFENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.

In proportion as the polemical tendency of the present period prevailed over the apologetical, the proofs for the truth and divinity of Christ's religion lost originality, and most writers were satisfied with the mere repetition of former statements.(1) The attacks of *Porphyry, Julian the Apostate,* and others, however, called forth new efforts in defence of Christianity ;(2) the accusations of the heathen, when Christianity was established as the religion of the world upon the ruins of the Western empire, induced *Augustine* to compose his apologetical treatise de civitate Dei.

(1) Among the apologists *previous* to the apostasy of Julian, *Arnobius* (adversus gentes) deserves to be noticed. His argument a tuto, ii. 4. is as follows :......nonne purior ratio est, ex duobus incertis et in ambigua expectatione pendentibus id potius credere, quod aliquas spes ferat, quam omnino quod nullas ? In illo enim periculi nihil est, si quod dicitur imminere cassum fiat et vacuum : in hoc damnum est maximum, *i. e.* salutis amissio, si cum tempus advenerit aperiatur, non fuisse mendacium. *Eusebius* of Cæsarea likewise defended Christianity in his præpar. and demonstr. evang. (§ 82, note 1) : *Athanasius* in his λόγος κατὰ Ἕλληνας, etc.

(2) *Eusebius*, l. c., *Theodoret, Augustine,* and others combated Porphyry : Eusebius also opposed Hierocles in a separate treatise. *Cyril of Alexandria* wrote 10 books against the Emperor Julian, who charged Christianity with contradictions.—The dialogue entitled Philopatris formerly ascribed to Lucian, may have been composed under the same emperor, see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 1. p. 191.

§ 118.

MIRACLES AND PROPHECY.

Since the Christians were accustomed to appeal to miracles and prophecies in support of the truth of their religion, it was of importance more precisely to define the idea of a miracle. *Augustine* did this by defining miracles as events which deviate not so much from the order of nature in general, as from that particular order of nature which is known to us.(1) With regard to prophecies, many passages of the Old Test. were still applied to the Messiah, which had no reference to him, and the truly Messianic passages were taken in a less comprehensive sense than historical interpretation required.(2) The apologists also appealed to Christ's prophecy respecting the destruction of Jerusalem, which had long since received its accomplishment, to the fate of the Jewish nation,(3) and the similar judgment with which God had visited the Roman empire, and compared these events with the triumphant spread of the gospel.(4) And, lastly, even Augustine takes notice of the Sibylline oracles, mentioned by Lactantius.(5)

(1) Aug. de utilitate cred. c. 16: Miraculum voco, quidquid arduum aut insolitum supra spem vel facultatem mirantis apparet.—de civ. D. l. xxi. c. 8: Omnia portenta *contra* naturam dicimus esse, sed non sunt. Quomodo est enim contra naturam quod Dei fit voluntate, quum voluntas tanti utique conditoris conditæ rei cujusque natura sit? Portentum ergo fit non contra naturam, sed *contra quam est nota natura*...quamvis et ipsa quæ in rerum natura omnibus nota sunt non minus mira sint, essentque stupenda considerantibus cunctis, si solerent homines mirari nisi rara.—The nearer the Canon of the Bible was brought to a conclusion, the more necessary it became to make a distinction between the miracles related in Scripture, as historically authenticated facts, and those miracles which were generally believed still to take place in the church. Respecting faith in

miracles in general, Augustine expressed himself very freely, de civit. Dei xxi. c. 6. 7. (in reference to miraculous phenomena, but his language is also applicable to other miraculous stories of the age); Nec ergo volo temere credi cuncta, quæ posui, exceptis his, quæ ipse sum expertus. Cetera vero sic habeo, ut neque affirmanda, neque neganda decreverim. Comp. de util. cred. l. c. de vera rel. 25. (Retract. i. c. 13.) Concerning the miracles related in Scripture themselves, it was of importance to distinguish the miracles performed by Jesus from those wrought by Apollonius of Tyana, to which Hierocles and others appealed. Augustine therefore directed attention to the benevolent design of Christ's miracles, by which they are distinguished from those which are merely performed for the purpose of gaining the applause of men, (*e. g.* the attempt to fly in the presence of an assembled multitude) de util. cred. l. c. Comp. *Cyr. Alex.* contra Jul. i. 1.: Ἐγὼ δὲ, ὅτι μὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀπηλλάγμεθα ἐμβροντησίας καὶ πολὺς ἀποτειχίζει λόγος τῶν ἐκείνων τερθρείας τὰ χριστιανῶν, φαίην ἄν· κοινωνία γὰρ οὐδεμία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μερὶς πιστῷ μετὰ ἀπίστου—On the view of *Gregory the Great* respecting miracles see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. iii. p. 294, 95.

(2) *Augustine* gives a canon on this point, de civit. Dei xvii. c. 16, ss. comp. xviii. 29, ss., and below § 122, note 4.

(3) *Aug.* de civ. D. iv. 34 :...Et nunc quod (Judæi) per omnes fere terras gentesque dispersi sunt, illius unius veri Dei providentia est. Comp. xviii. c. 46.

(4) *Arnob.* ii. p. 44, 45 : Nonne vel hæc saltem fidem vobis faciunt argumenta credendi, quod jam per omnes terras in tam brevi temporis spatio immensi nominis hujus sacramenta diffusa sunt? quod nulla jam natio est tam barbari moris et mansuetudinem nesciens, quæ non ejus amore versa molliverit asperitatem suam et in placidos sensus adsumta tranquillitate migraverit? *Aug.* civ. D. v. 25, 26. xviii. 50 :...inter horrendas persecutiones et varios cruciatus ac funera Martyrum prædicatum est toto orbe evangelium, contestante Deo signis et ostentis et variis virtutibus, et Spiritus Sancti muneribus : ut populi gentium credentes in eum, qui pro eorum redemtione crucifixus est, Christiano amore venerarentur sanguinem Martyrum, quem diabolico furore uderunt; ipsique reges, quorum legibus vastabatur Ecclesia, ei nomini salubriter subderentur, quod de terra crudeliter auferre conati sunt; et falsos deos inciperent persequi, quorum causa cultores Dei veri fuerant antea persecuti.

(5) Lact. iv. 15, 26. Aug. de civ. Dei xviii. 23. Cyrill. Alex. contra Jul. i. 1. But the enemies of Christianity maintained, even in the times of Lactantius, non esse illa carmina Sibyllina, sed a Christianis conficta atque composita.

§ 119.

SOURCES OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.—BIBLE AND TRADITION.

During the present period both the *Bible* and *tradition* were regarded as the sources of Christian knowledge.(1) The statement of *Augustine,* that he was induced by the authority of the church alone to believe in the gospel, only proves that he considered the believer, but not the Bible, to be dependent on that authority.(2) In ecclesiastical controversies and elsewhere the Bible was appealed to as highest authority,(3) and its perusal recommended to the people as the source of truth, and the book of books.(4)

(1) Nihil aliud præcipi volumus, quam quod Evangelistarum et Apostolorum fides et traditio incorrupta servat, *Gratian* in Cod. Theod. l. xvi. tit. vi. 1, 2.

(2) Adv. Man. 5: Evangelio non crederem, nisi me ecclesiæ catholicæ commoveret auctoritas. This passage is to be compared in its whole connection: see *Lücke,* Zeitschrift für evangel. Christen. i. 1. 4. Lücke justly rejects, ibid. p. 71, the expedient adopted by older protestant theologians, e. g. *Bucer* and *S. Baumgarten* (Untersuchung theologischer Streitigkeiten, vol. iii. p. 48.) viz. to assign to the imperfect tense the signification of the pluperfect " *according to the African dialect.*"

(3) *Athanasius* contra gent. i. p. 1. b.: *Αὐτάϱϰεις μὲν γάϱ εἰσιν αἱ ἁγίαι ϰαὶ ϑεόπνευστοι γϱαφαὶ πϱὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληϑείας ἀπαγγελίαν.*—*Chrys.* contra Anomœos xi. Opp. i. p. 542. *Aug.* Doctr. christ. i. 37: Titubabit fides, si scripturarum sacrarum vacillet auctoritas. ib. ii. 9, and many other passages.

(4) *Aug.* Ep. 137. (Opp. ii. p. 310): (Scriptura Sacra) omnibus (est) accessibilis, quamvis paucissimis penetrabilis. Ea, quæ aperte continet, quasi amicus familiaris sine fuco ad cor loquitur indoctorum atque doctorum.—De doctr. christ. ii. 42: Quantum

autem minor est auri argenti vestisque copia, quam de Ægypto secum ille populus abstulit in comparatione divitiarum, quæ postea Hierosolymæ consecutus est, quæ maxime in Salomone ostenduntur, tanta fit cuncta scientia, quæ quidem est utilis, collecta de libris gentium, si divinarum scripturarum scientiæ comparetur. Nam quicquid homo extra didicerit, si noxium est, ibi damnatur, si utile est, ibi invenitur. Et cum ibi quisque invenerit omnia, quæ utiliter alibi didicit, multo abundantius ibi inveniet ea, quæ nusquam omnino alibi, sed in illarum tantummodo Scripturarum mirabili altitudine et mirabili humilitate discuntur. Comp. Theodoret, Protheoria in Psalm. Opp. T. i. p. 602. Basilii M. Hom. in Ps. i. (Opp. i. p. 90.) *Rudelbach*, l. c. p. 38, and *Neander*, gewichtvolle Aussprüche alter Kirchenlehrer über den allgemeinen und rechten Gebrauch der heil. Schrift, in his kleinen Gelegenheitsschriften Berlin 1839, p. 155, ss. *Chrysostom*, however, is far from making salvation dependent on the letter of Scripture. In his opinion it would be much better, if we needed no Scripture at all, provided the grace of God were as distinctly written upon our hearts, as the characters are upon the book. (Introduct. to the homilies on Matth. Opp. T. vii. p. 1.) In the same manner *Augustine* says de doctr. christ. i. 39: Homo itaque fide, spe et caritate subnixus, eaque inconcusse retinens non indiget Scripturis nisi ad alios instruendos. Itaque multi per hæc tria etiam in solitudine sine codicibus vivunt. Unde in illis arbitrare jam impletum esse quod dictum est (1 Cor. xiii. 8): Sive prophetæ evacuabuntur, sive linguæ cessabunt, sive scientia evacuabitur, etc.

§ 120.

THE CANON.

Lücke, über den neutestamentlichen Kanon des Eusebius von Cäsarea. Berlin 1816. *Spittler, L. T.*, Kritische Untersuchung des 60sten laodicäischen Kanons. Bremen 1777.—On the other side: *Bickel*, in the theologische Studien und Kritiken 1830, part 3, p. 591, ss. [*Stuart*, Critical History and Defence of the Old Test. Canon, p. 438, ss. 447, ss.]

The more firmly the doctrine of the church was established, the nearer the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures, the principal parts of which had been determined in the times of *Eusebius,* (1) was brought to its completion. The synods of Laodicea,(2) of Hippo, and (the third) of Carthage(3) contributed to this result. The theologians of the Eastern church distinctly separated the later productions of the Greco-jewish literature (*i. e.* the apocryphal books, libri ecclesiastici) from the Canon of the Old Test. *i. e.* the literature of the Hebrew nation. But although *Rufinus*(4) and *Jerome* endeavoured to maintain the same distinction in the Latin church, it became the general custom to follow Augustine in doing away with the distinction between the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old Test., and in considering both as equal.(5) The Canon of the Manichæans differed considerably from that of the Catholic church.(6)

(1) Eus. h. e. iii. 25, adopts three classes, viz. ὁμολογούμενα, ἀντιλεγόμενα, νόθα (whether and in how far the last two classes differ, see *Lücke*, l. c.)—To the first class belong the four gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of Paul (inclusive of the Epistle to the Hebrews,) the first Epistle of John, and the first Epistle of Peter; to the Antilegomena belong the Epistles of James, Jude, the second of Peter, and, lastly, the second and third Epistles of John. With regard to the book of Revelation the opinions differ. The following are reckoned among the νόθα: Acta Pauli, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the apostolical constitutions. The ἄτοπα καὶ δυσσεβῆ rank below the νόθα.

(2) The Synod of Laodicea was held about the middle of the fourth century (between the years 360 and 364.) In the 59th canon it was enacted, that no uncanonical book should be used in the churches, and in the 60th a list was given of the canonical books, in *Mansi*, ii. 574. In this list all the Hebrew writings of the Old Testament are received, and the apocryphal books excluded (with the exception of the book of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah.) The canon of the New Test. is the same as ours, except the book of Revelation, which, however, was considered genuine in Egypt (by Athanasius and Cyrill.) But mention is made of the seven Catholic Epistles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews ascribed to Paul.—For further particulars see the introductions to the New Test.

(3) A. D. 393, and A. D. 397. These synods number the Apocrypha of the Old Test. among the canonical books. Comp. the 36th canon Conc. Hippon. in *Mansi*, iii. 924, and Concil. Carth. 11. c. 47. *Mansi*, iii. 891. Innocent I. (A. D. 405,) and Gelasius I. (A. D. 494) (?) confirmed their decisions.

(4) *Rufini*, Expos. Symb. (l. c.) p. 26 : Sciendum tamen est, quod et alii libri sunt, qui non catholici, sed ecclesiastici a majoribus appellati sunt, ut est Sapientia Salomonis et alia Sapientia, quæ dicitur filii Syrach, qui liber apud Latinos hoc ipso generali vocabulo Ecclesiasticus appellatur......Ejusdem ordinis est libellus Tobiæ et Judith et Maccabæorum libri. He places the Shepherd of Hermas on the same footing with the Apocrypha of the Old Test., and maintains that they might be read, but not quoted as authorities, " ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam." Comp. Hier. in Prologo galeato, quoted by *De Wette*, Einleitung, i. p. 45.

(5) Aug. de doctr. chr. ii. 8, and other passages quoted by *De Wette*, l. c. Comp. *Münscher*, Handb. iii. p. 64, ss. *Gregory the Great*, mor. lib. xix. c. 21: Non inordinate agimus, si ex libris, licet non canonicis, sed tamen ad ædificationem ecclesiæ editis testimoniam proferamus. He makes only a relative distinction between the Old and New Test., lib. i. hom. 6, in Ezech.: Divina eloquia, etsi temporibus distincta, sunt tamen sensibus unita.

(6) *Münscher*, l. c. p. 91, ss. *Trechsel*, über den Kanon, die Kritik und Exegese der Manichäer. Bern. 1832. 8. The authenticity of the Old Test., and the connection between the Old and the New Testaments was defended in opposition to the Manichæans, especially by *Augustine*, de mor. eccles. cath. i. c. 27. de utilitate credendi, and elsewhere.

§ 121.

INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION.

[*Davidson, S.*, Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 111–162.] On the literature, comp. § 32.

The writers of the present period regarded inspiration as having reference either spiritually to the doctrines, or mechanically to the letter of Scripture. Not only were the contents of Holy Writ considered to be divinely inspired,(1) but it was also thought a crime even to suppose the possibility of chronological errors, and historical contradictions on the part of the Sacred penmen.(2) On the other hand, their different peculiarities as men were not overlooked, but made use of, in order to explain the diversity of their mode of perception and style.(3) The allegorical system of interpretation gave way in the East to the sober grammatical method of the Antiochian school.(4) In the West, on the contrary, some intimations of Augustine led to the adoption of a fourfold sense of Scripture, which was afterwards firmly established by the scholastic divines of the next period.(5)

(1) This may be seen from certain general phrases which, having originated in the preceding period, had now come into general use, such as ϑεία γϱαφή, κυϱιακαὶ γϱαφαί, ϑεόπνευστοι γϱαφαί, cœlestes litteræ (Lact. Inst. iv. c. 22,) as well as the simile of the lyre, (comp. § 32, note 4,) which was applied in a somewhat different sense by Chrys. hom. de Ignat. Opp. ii. p. 594.

(2) *Eusebius* of Cæsarea says that it is ϑϱασὺ καὶ πϱοπετές to assert that the sacred writers could have substituted one name for another, *e. g.* Abimelech for Achish (Ἀγχοῦς.) Comment. in Ps xxxiii. in *Montfaucon*, coll. nov. T. i. p. 129. That *Chrysostom* designates the words of the apostle not as such, but as words of the Holy Spirit, or of God (in Ev. Joh. hom. i. Opp. T. viii. p. 6. de Lazaro conc. 4. Opp. i. p. 755, and elsewhere), may partly be ascribed to his practico-rhetorical tendency. As he calls the mouth of the prophets the mouth of God (in Act. App. hom. xix. Opp. T. ix. p. 159,) so *Augustine* (de consensu Evv. i. 35), compares the apostles with the hands which noted down that which Christ, the head, dictated. He also calls (in Conf. vii. 21) the Sacred Scriptures venerabilem stilum Spir. S. He informs Jerome of his theory of inspiration in the following manner (Ep. 82. Opp. ii. p. 143): Ego enim fateor caritati tuæ, solis eis Scripturarum libris, qui jam canonici appellantur, didici hunc timorem honoremque deferre, ut nullum eorum auctorem scribendo aliquid errasse firmissime credam.

Ac si aliquid in eis offendero litteris, quod videatur contrarium veritati, nihil aliud, quam vel mendosum esse codicem, vel interpretem non assecutum esse, quod dictum est, vel me minime intellexisse non ambigam. Alios autem ita lego, ut quantalibet sanctitate doctrinaque præpolleant, non ideo verum putem, quia ipsi ita senserunt, sed quia mihi vel per illos auctores canonicos, vel probabili ratione, quod a vero non abhorreat, persuadere potuerunt. Nevertheless he admits (ibid. p. 150, § 24,) that the canonical authority may be restricted, inasmuch as in reference to the dispute between Paul and Peter, he places the former above the latter. Comp. de civ. Dei xviii. 41: Denique auctores nostri, in quibus non frustra sacrarum litterarum figitur et terminatur canon, absit ut inter se aliqua ratione dissentiant. Unde non immerito, cum illa scriberent, eis Deum vel per eos locutum, non pauci in scholis atque gymnasiis litigiosis disputationibus garruli, sed in agris atque in urbibus cum doctis atque indoctis tot tantique populi crediderunt.—His opinion concerning the miraculous origin of the Septuagint version accords with that of the earlier Fathers, ibid. c. 42–44, where he attributes (as many Hyperlutherans afterwards did in reference to the Lutheran translation) the defects of that translation to a kind of inspiration which had regard to the circumstances of the times. But this odd notion does not exclude the noble idea of a revelation which continues to manifest itself—an idea which is above the narrow adherence to the letter, and forms the basis of his belief in tradition.—Similar views probably induced *Gregory the Great* to say in reference to the researches of learned men relative to the author of the book of Job, that it was not necessary to know the pen with which the King of Kings had written his royal letter, but that it sufficed to have a full conviction of its Divine contents Thus he assigns, on the one hand, the authorship of this book to the Holy Spirit, while on the other he leaves open all discussions concerning the human instruments—discussions which were greatly dreaded in later times. Gregory the Great Moral. in Job. præf. c. 1, §. 2.

(3) Thus *Theodore of Mopsuestia*, who went perhaps farther than any other writer, assumed different degrees of inspiration. He ascribed to Solomon not the gift of prophecy, but only that of wisdom, and judged of the book of Job and the Song of Solomon only from the human point of view. Hence the fifth œcumenical synod found fault with him on this very ac

count, *Mansi* ix. 223. But *Chrysostom*, and also *Jerome*, admitted human peculiarities, the one in reference to the gospels (Hom. i. in Matth.), the other with respect to the apostle Paul (on Gal. v. 12.); comp. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 2, p. 751. *Basil the Great* says respecting the prophets (in the commentary on Isaiah commonly ascribed to him, Opp. T. i. p. 379, ed. Ben.): " As it is not every substance which is fitted to reflect images, but only such as possess a certain smoothness and transparency, so the effective power of the Spirit is not visible in all souls, but only in such as are neither perverse nor distorted;" (*Rudelbach*,) p. 28. *Augustine* (de consensu evang. ii. 12.) asserts, that the evangelists had written ut quisque meminerat, ut cuique cordi erat, vel brevius vel prolixius: but he is careful not to be misunderstood, lib. i. c. 2: Quamvis singuli suum quendam narrandi ordinem tenuisse videantur, non tamen unusquisque eorum velut alterius ignarus voluisse scribere reperitur, vel ignorata prætermisisse, quæ scripsisse alius invenitur: sed sicut unicuique inspiratum est, non superfluam cooperationem sui laboris adjunxit.—Concerning *Gregory of Nazianzum*, comp. Orat. ii. 105, p. 60. See *Ullmann*, p. 305, note.—*Epiphanius* opposed very decidedly the notions derived from the old μαντική (comp. § 32.) according to which the inspired writers were entirely passive, and supposed that the prophets enjoyed a clear perception of the Divine, a calm disposition of mind, etc. Comp. hær. 48, c. 3, and *Jerome* Procem. in Nahum, in Habacuc et in Jesaiam: Neque vero, ut Montanus cum insanis feminis somniat, Prophetæ in exstasi sunt locuti, ut nescirent, quid loquerentur, et quum alios erudirent, ipsi ignorarent, quod dicerent. Though Jerome allows that human (*e. g.* grammatical) faults might have occurred, yet he guards himself against any dangerous inferences which might be drawn from his premises (Comment. in ep. ad Ephes. lib. ii. ad cap. iii. 1): Nos, quotiescunque solœcismos aut tale quid annotamus, non Apostolum pulsamus, ut malevoli criminantur, sed magis Apostoli assertores sumus, etc. According to him the Divine power of the word itself destroyed these apparent blemishes, or caused believers to overlook them. " *The opinion of these theologians manifestly was, that the external phenomena do not preclude the reality of the highest effects of Divine grace.*" *Rudelbach*, p. 42.

(4) *Theodoret*, who may be considered as the representative of this tendency, rejects both the false allegorical, and the merely historical systems of interpretation, Protheoria in Psalmos (ed Schulze) T. i. p. 603, in ***Rudelbach***, p. 36. (He calls the latter a Jewish rather than Christian interpretation.) Comp. *Münter*, über die antiochen. Schule, l. c. and *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 2, p. 748, ss.

(5) It is remarkable that *Augustine*, on the one hand, understands all biblical narratives in their strictly historical, literal sense; and, on the other, leaves ample scope for allegorical interpretation. Thus he takes much pains, de civ. Dei xv. 27, to defend the narrative of the ark of Noah against mathematical and physical objections (he even supposes a miracle by which carnivorous animals were changed into herbivorous), nevertheless he thinks that all this had happened only ad præfigurandam ecclesiam, and represents the clean and unclean animals as types of Judaism and Paganism, etc. [Comp. also ***Davidson***, l. c. p. 138, where another specimen is given.] The passage de genes. ad litter. ab. init.: In libris autem omnibus sanctis intueri oportet, quæ ibi æterna intimentur, quæ facta narrentur, quæ futura prænuntientur, quæ agenda præcipiantur, has given rise to the doctrine of a fourfold sense of Scripture; comp. with it de util. cred. 3: omnis igitur scriptura, quæ testamentum vetus vocatur, diligenter eam nosse cupientibus quadrifariam traditur, secundum historiam, secundum ætiologiam, secundum analogiam, secundum allegoriam; the further exposition of his views is given ibid. [*Davidson*, l. c. p. 137.] According to *Augustine* seven things are necessary to the right interpretation of Scripture, doctr. christ. ii. 7: *timor, pietas, scientia, fortitudo, consilium, purgatio cordis, sapientia.* But he who will perfectly interpret an author, must be animated by love to him, de util. cred. 6: Agendum enim tecum prius est, ut auctores ipsos non oderis, deinde ut ames, et hoc agendum quovis alio modo potius, quam exponendis eorum sententiis et literis. Propterea quia si Virgilium odissemus, imo si non eum, priusquam intellectus esset, majorum nostrum commendatione diligeremus, nunquam nobis satisfieret de illis ejus quæstionibus innumerabilibus, quibus grammatici agitari et perturbari solent, nec audiremus libenter, qui cum ejus laude illas expediret, sed ei faveremus, qui per eas illum errasse ac delirasse conaretur ostendere. Nunc vero cum eas multi ac varie pro suo quisque captu aperire con-

entur, his potissimum plauditur, per quorum expositionem melior invenitur poëta, qui non solum nihil peccasse, sed nihil non laudabiliter cecinisse ab eis etiam qui illum non intelligunt, creditur......Quantum erat, ut similem benevolentiam præberemus eis, per quos locutum esse spiritum sanctum tam diuturna vetustate firmatum est?

§ 122.

TRADITION AND THE CONTINUANCE OF INSPIRATION.

The belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures neither excluded faith in existing tradition, nor in a continuance of inspiration. Not only passing visions, by which pious individuals received Divine instructions and disclosures,(1) were compared to the revelations recorded in Scripture, but still more the continued inspiration which the Fathers enjoyed when assembled in council.(2) In course of time it became necessary to lay down certain rules by which to judge of ecclesiastical tradition developing itself on its own historical foundation in order to prevent possible abuses. Such rules were drawn up by *Vincentius Lerinensis,* who laid down the three criteria of *antiquitas* (vetustas), *universitas,* and *consensio,* as marks of true ecclesiastical tradition.(3)

(1) Comp. *Münscher,* Handbuch. iii. p. 100: "*Such exalted views on inspiration cannot appear strange to us, since they existed in an age when Christians believed and recorded numerous Divine revelations and inspirations still granted to holy men, and especially to monks.*" Such revelations of course were supposed not to be contradictory either to Scripture, or to the tradition of the church. Thus the voice from heaven, which said to Augustine: "*Ego sum, qui sum,*"—and "*tolle lege,*" directed him to the Scriptures. Conf. viii. 12.

(2) The decisions of the councils were represented as decisions of the Holy Spirit (placuit Spiritui Sancto et nobis.) Comp. the letter of Constantine to the church of Alexandria, Socrat. i. 9: "Ὁ *γὰρ τοῖς τριακοσίοις ἤρεσεν ἐπισκόποις, οὐδέν ἐστιν ἕτερον, ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ γνώμη, μάλιστά γε ὅπου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τοιούτων καὶ τηλικούτων ἀνδρῶν*

διανοίαις ἐγκείμενον τὴν θείαν βούλησιν ἐξεφώτισεν. The emperor, indeed, spoke thus as a layman. But Pope *Leo the Great* expressed himself in the same way, and claimed inspiration not only for councils, ep. 114. 2. 145. 1, but also for emperors and imperial decretals, ep. 162. 3. ep. 148. 84. 1, even for himself, ep. 16, and serm. 25. Comp. *Griesbach*, Opusc. i. p. 21. Concerning the somewhat different opinions of *Gregory of Nazianzum*, (ep. ad Procop. 55,) on the one hand, and of *Augustine* (de bapt. contra Don. ii. c. 3,) and *Facundus* of Hermiane (defensio trium capitul. c. 7,) on the other, see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 1. p. 374–79. In accordance with his views on the relation of the Septuagint to the original Hebrew (§ 121), *Augustine* supposes that the decisions of earlier councils were completed by those of later ones, without denying the inspiration of the former, since "*the decision of councils only gives public sanction to that result which the developement of the church had reached.*" Inspiration accommodates itself to the wants of the time. Respecting this "economy," and its abuses, see *Münscher*, l. c. p. 156, ss.

(3) Commonitorium, or Tractatus pro catholicæ fidei antiquitate et universitate (composed in the year 433.) *Vincentius* assumes a twofold source of knowledge, 1. divinæ legis auctoritas, 2. ecclesiæ catholicæ traditio. The latter is necessary on account of the different interpretations given to Scripture. The sensus ecclesiasticus is the only right one. Vincentius, like Augustine, also supposes that tradition may in a certain sense *advance*, so that any opinion, respecting which the church has not as yet pronounced a decision, is not to be considered heretical, but may be condemned as such, if it be contrary to the more fully developed faith of the church. Thus many of the opinions of the earlier Fathers might be reconciled with the decisions of later councils.

2. *The Doctrine Concerning God.*

§ 123.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

The prevailing tendency to didactic demonstration induced men to attempt the establishment of a philosophical proof of the existence of God, in which Christians had hitherto believed as an axiom.(1) In the writings of some of the Fathers, both of the preceding and present periods, *e. g. Athanasius* and *Gregory of Nazanzium,* we meet with what might be called the *physico-theological* argument, if we understand by it an argument drawn from the beauty and wisdom displayed in nature, which is always calculated to promote practical piety. But both the writers before mentioned mistrusted a merely objective proof, and showed that a pure and pious mind would best find and know God.(2) The *cosmological* proof propounded by *Diodorus of Tarsus,*(3) and the *ontological* argument of *Augustine* and *Boëthius,*(4) lay claim to a higher degree of logical precision and philosophical certainty. The former argument was based upon the principle that there must be a sufficient ground for every thing. Augustine and Boëthius inferred the existence of God from the existence of general ideas—a proof which was more fully developed in the next period by *Anselm,* and still later by *Cartesius,* on which account it has often been named after either of them.

(1) Even *Arnobius* considered this belief to be an *axiom*, and thought it quite as dangerous to attempt to *prove* the existence of God, as to deny it; adv. gent. i. c. 33: Quisquamne est hominum, qui non cum principis notione diem nativitatis intraverit? cui non sit ingenitum, non affixum, imo ipsis pæne in genitalibus matris non impressum, non insitum, esse regem ac dominum, cunctorum quæcunque sunt moderatorem?

(2) *Athan.* adv. gent. i. p. 3, ss. (like Theophilus of Antioch, comp. § 35. note 1.) starts with the idea, that none but a pure and sinless soul can see God (Matth. v. 8.) He too compares the heart of man to a mirror. But as it became sullied by sin, God revealed himself by means of his *creation,* and when this proved no longer sufficient, by the prophets, and, lastly, by the Logos. *Gregory of Nazianzum* argues in a similar way; he infers the existence of the Creator from his works, as the sight of a lyre reminds us both of him who made it, and of him who plays it,

Orat. xxviii. 6, p. 499. Comp. Orat. xxviii. 16, p. 507, 508. Orat. xiv. 33, p. 281. *He* too appeals to Matth. v. 8. "Rise from thy low condition by thy conversation, by purity of heart unite thyself to the pure. Wilt thou become a divine, and worthy of the Godhead? Then keep God's commandments, and walk according to his precepts, *for action is the first step to knowledge.*" *Ullmann*, p. 317.—*Augustine* also propounds in an eloquent manner, and in the form of a prayer, what is commonly called the physico-theological argument (Conf. x. 6): Sed et cœlum et terra et omnia, quæ in eis sunt, ecce undique mihi dicunt, ut te amem, nec cessant dicere omnibus, ut sint inexcusabiles, etc. *Ambrose, Basil the Great, Chrysostom*, and others express themselves in much the same manner.

(3) *Diodorus* κατὰ εἱμαρμένης in Phot. Bibl. Cod. 223, p. 209, b. The world is subject to change. But this change presupposes something constant at its foundation, the variety of creatures points to a creative unity; for change itself is a condition which has had a commencement: Εἰ δέ τις ἀγένητον λέγοι αὐτῶν τὴν τροπὴν, τὸ πάντων ἀδυνατώτερον εἰσάγει· τροπὴ γὰρ πάθος ἐστὶν ἀρχόμενον, καὶ οὐκ ἄν τις εἴποι τροπὴν ἄναρχον· καὶ συντόμως εἰπεῖν, τῶν στοιχείων καὶ τῶν ἐξ αὐτῶν ζώων τε καὶ σωμάτων ἡ πάνσοφος τροπὴ, καὶ τῶν σχημάτων καὶ χρωμάτων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ποιοτήτων ἡ ποικίλη διαφορὰ μόνον οὐχὶ φωνὴν ἀφίησι μήτε ἀγέννητον μήτε αὐτόματον νομίζειν τὸν κόσμον, μήτ' αὖ ἀπρονόητον, θεὸν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὸ εἶναι καὶ τὸ εὖ εἶναι παρασχόμενον σαφῶς εἰδέναι καὶ ἀδιστάκτως ἐπίστασθαι.

(4) *August.* de lib. arbitr. lib. ii. c. 3. 15. [He asserts that man is composed of existence, life, and thinking, and shows that the last is the most excellent; hence he infers that that by which thinking is regulated, and which, therefore, must be superior to thinking itself, is the summum bonum. He finds this summum bonum in those general laws which every thinking person must acknowledge, and according to which he must form his opinion respecting thinking itself. The sum total of these laws or rules is called *truth* or *wisdom* (veritas, sapientia). The absolute is therefore equal to truth itself. God is truth. Illa veritatis et sapientiæ pulcritudo, tantum adsit perpetua voluntas fruendi, nec multitudine audientium constipate secludit venientes, nec peragitur tempore, nec migrat locis, nec nocte intercipitur, nec umbrâ intercluditur, nec sensibus corporis subjacet. De toto mundo ad se conversis qui diligunt eam omnibus proxima est, omnibus sempiterna; nullo loco est, nusquam deest;

foris admonit, inter docet; cernentes se commutat omnes in melias, a nullo in deterius commutatur; nullus de illa judicat, nullus sine illa judicat bene. Ac per hoc eam manifestum est mentibus nostris, quæ ab ipsa una fiant singulæ sapientes, et non *de* ipsa, sed *per* ipsam de ceteris judices, sine dubitatione esse potiorem. Tu autem concesseras, si quid supra mentes nostras esse monstrarem, Deum te esse confessurum, *si adhuc nihil esset superius*. Si enim aliquid est excellentius, ille potius Deus est: *si autem non est, jam ipsa veritas Deus est. Sive ergo illud sit, sive non sit, Deum tamen esse negare non poteris*]—*Boëthius* expresses himself still more definitively, de consol. phil. v. Prosa 10; he shows that empirical observation and the perception of the imperfect lead necessarily to the idea of perfection and its reality in God: Omne enim quod imperfectum esse dicitur, id diminutione perfecti imperfectum esse perhibitur. Quo sit, ut si in quolibet genere imperfectum quid esse videatur, in eo perfectum quoque aliquid esse necesse sit. Etenim perfectione sublata, unde illud quod imperfectum perhibetur extiterit, ne fingi quidem potest. Neque a diminutis inconsummatisque natura rerum cepit exordium, sed ab integris absolutisque procedens, in hæc extrema atque effœta dilabitur. Quod si......est quædam boni fragilis imperfecta felicitas, esse aliquam solidam perfectamque non potest dubitari......Deum rerum omnium principum *bonum* esse, communis humanorum conceptio probat animorum. Nam cum nihil Deo melius excogitari queat, id quo melius nihil est, bonum esse quis dubitet? ita vero bonum esse Deum ratio demonstrat, ut perfectum quoque in eo bonum esse convincat. Nam ni tale sit, rerum omnium princeps esse non poterit......Quare ne in infinitum ratio procedat, confitendum esse summum Deum summi perfectique boni esse plenissimum. Compare *Schleiermacher*, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 166: "*Augustine is said to have given the first proof of the existence of God. But we are not to understand by this, that he demonstrated it in an objectionable manner,* i. e. *objectively*; *he only desires to show, that the idea of God is at the foundation of all human speculation.*"

§ 124.

THE NATURE OF GOD.

The definitions of orthodox theologians respecting the Trinity were, on the one hand, based on the supposition that God may be known by means of his revelation, and, on the other, implied that the contents of that same revelation are a *mystery*. These theologians, therefore, took no offence at the contradiction involved in such definitions, but thought it quite proper that reason should submit to revelation. The Arians, on the contrary, in accordance with their more rationalistic system, which was principally carried out in all its logical consequences by *Eunomius*, asserted the possibility of a perfect knowledge of God.(1) Though the ideas concerning the Divine Being, and the doctrinal definitions of the church, were still mixed up with much that savoured of anthropomorphism,(2) yet the speculative tendency of the most eminent theologians of the present period led them carefully to avoid all gross representations of the Godhead. Thus *Athanasius* taught that God is above all existence; *Augustine* doubted whether it would be proper to call God a substance.(3) *Gregory of Nazianzum*, on the other hand, showed, that it is not sufficient merely to deny the sensuous.(4) The gross and carnal notions of the *Audians* concerning God met with little approbation,(5) while the *Monophysites*, by blending the Divine and the human, promoted anthropomorphism under the mask of Christian orthodoxy.(6)

---

(1) According to Socrat. iv. 7, *Eunomius* maintained, that we know quite as much of the nature of God, as the Creator himself. It does not follow, because the mind of some is impaired with sin, that the same is true in reference to all. The natural man indeed does not possess the knowledge in question; but what is the use of a revelation which reveals nothing?

Christ has opened unto us a way to the perfect knowledge of God. He is the door, viz. to this knowledge. Eunomius attached the greatest importance to the theoretical, didactical part of religion, and supposed its very essence to consist in the ἀκρίβεια τῶν δογμάτων. Comp. the refutations of Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa, and of Basil. *Klose*, Geschichte und Lehre des Eunomius. Kiel, 1833, p. 36, ss. *Ullmann*, Gregory of Naz. p. 318, ss. *Neander*, Chrysostomus, i. p. 353, and Kirchengesch. ii. 2, p. 854. The latter defines the characteristic feature of Eunomius as "*supranaturalistic dogmatism, which is closely allied to rationalism;*" his opponents charged him with having changed *theology* into *technology*. *Basil* also reminds him (Ep. 16.) of the impossibility of explaining the nature of God, since he cannot explain the nature even of an ant! The Arian *Philostorgius*, on the contrary, thought it praiseworthy, that Eunomius had abandoned the doctrine of the incomprehensibility of God, which *Arius* himself defended. Hist. eccles. x. 2, 3.

(2) Examples are given by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 136. [*Athanas.* de decret. syn. Nic. c. 11. *Cyrill*, Catech. iv. 5. *August.* Ep. 178. 14, 18, de divers. quæst. 20.] Comp. also *Lact.* Inst. vii. 21, where he calls the Holy Spirit purus ac liquidus, and in aquæ modum fluidus.

(3) *Athan.* contra gent. p. 3: Ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας, ὑπερούσιος. *Aug.* de trin. v. 2, vii. 5, prefers the use of the word *essentia* to *substantia*, comp. de civ. Dei xii. 2, though he calls himself (Ep. 177, 4.) God *substantialiter ubique diffusus*. Comp. *Boëthius* de trin. c. 4: Nam quum dicimus Deus, substantiam quidem significare *videmur*, sed eam, quæ sit *ultra substantiam*. Augustine's writings, however, contain many profound thoughts relative to the knowledge of God. But every thing shows how much he felt the insufficiency of language to express the nature of God, de doctr. christ. i. c. 6: Imo vero me nihil aliud quam dicere voluisse sentio. Si autem dixi, non est quod dicere volui. Hoc unde scio, nisi quia Deus ineffabilis est: quod autem a me dictum est, si ineffabile esset, dictum non esset. Ac per hoc ne ineffabilis quidem dicendus est Deus, quia et hoc cum dicitur, aliquid dicitur. Et fit nescio quæ pugna verborum, quoniam si illud est ineffabile, quod dici non potest, non est ineffabile quod vel ineffabile dici potest. Quæ pugna verborum silentio cavenda potius quam voce pacanda est. Et tamen Deus, cum de illo nihil

digne dici possit, admisit humanæ vocis obsequium et verbis nostris in laude sua gaudere nos voluit. Nam inde est quod et dicitur Deus.—On this account he, as well as Tertullian (§ 38, note 3,) assigns to anthropomorphism its proper position, de vera rel. 50: Habet enim omnis lingua sua quædam propria genera locutionum, quæ cum in aliam linguam transferuntur, videntur absurda, and the subsequent part of the passage; de genesi c. 17: Omnes, qui spiritaliter intelligunt scripturas, non membra corporea per ista nomina, sed *spiritales potentias* accipere didicerunt, sicut galeas et scutum et gladium et alia multa.—But he prefers this anthropomorphism, which forms an idea of God from corporeal and spiritual analogies, though it may be erroneous to the purely imaginary speculations of conceited philosophers, de trinit. Lib. i. ab init. It is not *we*, that know God, but God, who makes himself known to us, de vera rel. c. 48: Omnia, quæ de hac luce mentis a me dicta sunt, nulla quam eadem luce manifesta sunt. Per hanc enim intelligo vera esse quæ dicta sunt et hæc me intelligere per hanc rursus intelligo.—The same spirit is expressed in the beautiful passage from the (spurious) Soliloq. animæ c. 31: Qualiter cognovi te? Cognovi te in te; cognovi te non sicut tibi es, sed certe sicut mihi es, et non sine te, sed in te, quia tu es lux, quæ illuminasti me. Sicut enim tibi es, soli tibi cognitus es; sicut mihi es, secundum gratiam tuam et mihi cognitus es . . . Cognovi enim te, quoniam Deus meus es tu. (comp. Cyrill of Jerusalem below, § 127, note 1.)—According to *Gregory the Great*, Mor. xx. c. 32, our knowledge of God does not correspond to his nature. But it is not on that account false; we now see his image. Thus none can look steadfastly in to the sun when it rises; but from the mountains it shines upon we perceive that it is rising, comp. *Lau*, p. 348, ss.

(4) Orat. xxviii. 7—10, p. 500 sqq. in *Ullmann*, p. 530. The negative knowledge of God is of no more use, than to be told that twice five are neither 2, nor 3, nor 4, nor 5, nor 20, nor 40, without being told that it is 10.—Gregory thinks that the words ὁ ὢν and ϑεὸς are comparatively speaking the best expressions to denote the Divine being: but gives the preference to the name ὁ ὢν, partly because God applied it to himself (Ex. iii. 14.), partly because it is more significant. For the term ϑεός is derived from another word, and can be taken relatively (like the name *Lord*); but the appellation ὁ ὢν is in every

respect independent, and belongs to none but God. Orat. xxx. 17, and 18, p. 552, 553. *Ullmann*, p. 324, note.

(5) Comp. above § 106, note 5.

(6) Comp. what is said respecting Theopaschitism, § 102, note 3.

§ 125.

THE UNITY OF GOD.

Polytheism and Gnosticism having been defeated, it was of less importance in the present period, than in the preceding, to defend the *unity* of God. The dualism of the Manichæans alone called for a defence of Monotheism.(1) The definitions respecting the Trinity moreover made it necessary, that the church should not fail distinctly to declare, that the doctrine of the Trinity does not exclude that of the *unity* of God.(2) In treating of this subject, theologians used much the same language as those of the former period.(3)

(1) *Athanasius* contra gent. p. 6, combated the Dualism of the Gnostics. In opposition to the Manichæans, *Titus of Bostra* (contra Manich. lib. i. in Basnagii mon. t. 1. p. 63, ss.), *Didymus of Alexandria* (ibid. p. 204, 205), *Gregory of Nyssa* (contra Manich. syllogismi x. Opp. iii. p. 180), *Cyrill of Jerusalem* (Cat. vi. 20, p. 92, [94], and *Augustine* in his polemical writings, defended the doctrine of *one* Divine being.

(2) Comp. *e.g.* the Symbolum Athanasianum, § 97: et tamen non sunt tres Dii, etc. On the controversy with the Tritheites and Tetratheites, see § 96.

(3) E. g. *Lact.* i. 3. *Arnob.* l. iii. *Ruffin.* expos. p. 18: Quod autem dicimus, Orientis ecclesias tradere unum Deum, patrem omnipotentem et unum Dominum, hoc modo intelligendum est, unum non numero dici, sed universitate. Verbi gratia: si quis enim dicit unum hominem, aut unum equum, hic unum pro numero posuit. Potest enim et alius homo esse et tertius, vel equus. Ubi autem secundus vel tertius non potest jungi, unus si dicatur, non numeri, sed universitatis est nomen. Ut si e. c. dicamus unum solem, hic unus ita dicitur, ut alius vel tertius addi non possit: unus est enim sol. Multo magis ergo Deus

cum unus dicitur, unus non numeri, sed universitatis vocabulo notatur, i. e. quia propterea unus dicatur quod alius non sit.

§ 126.

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

Several theologians, *e. g. Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyrill of Jerusalem,* and others, showed that what we call the attributes of God, are only expressions by which we designate his relation to the world, and that these expressions are either negative or figurative.(1) But *Augustine* proved, in a very ingenious manner, that the attributes of God cannot be separated from his nature as contingent phenomena.(2) Other theologians of the present period were equally cautious in defining particular attributes, *e. g.* those of omniscience and omnipresence.(3) Some endeavoured to refine the idea of the retributive justice of God, and to defend it against the charge of arbitrariness,(4) while others again sought to reconcile the omniscience of God, and consequently his foreknowledge, with human liberty.(5)

(1) *Gregory* says, Orat. vi. 12, p. 187: There can be no *antithesis* in the Godhead, because it would *destroy* its very nature; the Godhead, on the contrary, is in so perfect a harmony not only with itself, but also with other beings, that some of the *names* of God have a particular reference to this agreement. Thus he is called *peace* and *love.*" Among the attributes of God he assigns (next to his eternity and infinity) the first place to love, see *Ullmann,* p. 333.—*Cyrill* of Jerusalem maintains that our ideas of God, and the attributes which we ascribe to him, are not adequate to his nature, Cat. vi. 2, p. 87, (Oxon. 78): *Λέγομεν γὰρ οὐχ ὅσα δεῖ περὶ θεόν (μόνῳ γὰρ αὐτῷ ταῦτα γνώριμα), ἀλλ' ὅσα ἡμετέρα ἀσθένεια βαστάσαι δύναται.* Οὐ *γὰρ τὸ, τί ἐστι Θεὸς, ἐξηγούμεθα· ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ ἀκριβὲς περὶ αὐτοῦ οὐκ οἴδαμεν, μετ' εὐγνωμοσύνης ὁμολογοῦμεν· ἐν τοῖς γὰρ περὶ Θεοῦ μεγάλη γνῶσις, τὸ τὴν ἀγνωσίαν ὁμολογεῖν* (comp. also the subsequent part of the passage.)

(2) De civ. Dei xi. 10: Propter hoc itaque natura dicitur simplex, cui non sit aliquid habere, quod vel possit amittere; vel

aliud sit habens, aliud quod habet; sicut vas aliquem liquorem, aut corpus colorem, aut aër lucem sive fervorem, aut anima sapientiam. Nihil enim horum est id quod habet: nam neque vas liquor est, nec corpus color, nec aër lux sive fervor, neque anima sapientia est. Hinc est, quod etiam privari possunt rebus quas habent, et in alios habitus vel qualitates verti atque mutari, ut et vas evacuetur humere quo plenum est, et corpus decoloretur, et aër tenebrescat, et anima desipiat, etc. (This reasoning is identical with the proposition of *Schleiermacher*, that in that which is absolute the subject and the predicate are one and the same thing; see his work: Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 166.) Comp. *Boëth.* de trin. 4: Deus vero hoc ipsum, quod est, Deus est; nihil enim aliud est, nisi quod est, ac per hoc ipsum Deus est. *Gregory the Great* treats of the attributes of God in the same manner, comp. *Lau*, p. 350, ss.

(3) God does not *know* things, because they are, but things are, because he *knows* them, *Aug.* l. c.: Ex quo occurrit animo quiddam mirum, sed tamen verum, quod iste mundus nobis notus esse non posset, nisi esset: Deo autem nisi notus esset, esse non posset. Respecting *omnipresence*, compare what he says, l. c. c. 20: Deus non alicubi est; quid enim alicubi est, continetur loco, quid loco continetur, corpus est. Non igitur alicubi est, et tamen quia est et in loco non est, in illo sunt potius omnia, quam ipse alicubi. He also excluded both the idea of space, and (in reference to the *eternity* of God) that of succession of time, Conf. ix. 10. 2: *fuisse* et *futurum esse* non est in vita divina, sed *esse* solum, quoniam æterna est. Nam fuisse et futurum esse non est æternum. Comp. de civ. Dei xi. 5.—He also rejected the notion of Origen (condemned by Justinian) that God had created only as many beings as he could survey, de civ. Dei xii. 18.

(4) *Lactantius* wrote a separate treatise: de ira Dei (Inst. lib. v.) on this subject. His principal argument is the following: If God could not hate, he could not love; since he loves good, he must hate evil, and bestow good upon those whom he loves, evil upon those whom he hates. Comp. *Augustine*, de vera rel. c. 15: Justa vindicta peccati plus tamen clementiæ Domini quam severitatis ostendit. Ita enim nobis sic adetur a corporis voluptatibus ad æternam essentiam veritatis amorem nostrum oportere converti. Et est justitiæ pulchritudo cum benignitatis gratia concordans, ut, quoniam bonorum inferiorum dulcedine

decepti sumus, amaritudine pœnarum erudiamur. De civ. Dei i. 9, and elsewhere.

(5) *Chrys.* in Ep. ad Eph. Hom. i. (on ch. i. 5,) distinguishes in this respect between an *antecedent* (ϑέλημα προηγούμενον), and a *subsequent* volition (ϑέλημα δεύτερον.) According to the former (τὸ σφοδρὸν ϑέλημα, ϑέλημα εὐδοκίας), all are to be saved, according to the latter sinners must be punished. [*August.* de civ. Dei v. c. 9, de lib. arbitr. iii. c. 4. *Boëthius* de cons. phil. v. prosa 6.]

§ 127.

CREATION.

Since the idea of generation from the essence of the Father was applied to the Son of God alone, and employed to denote the difference between him and the other persons of the Trinity on the one hand, and between him and all created beings on the other, the idea of *creation* was susceptible of a more precise definition. The notion of Origen was combated by *Methodius*,(1) and rejected by the chief supporters of orthodoxy, viz. *Athanasius* and *Augustine*.(2) The figurative interpretation of the narrative of the fall fell into disrepute along with the allegorical system of interpretation. It became therefore the more necessary to abide by the historical conception of the Mosaic account, inasmuch as it forms the basis of the history of the fall, which in its turn served as the foundation of the Augustinian theology. But Augustine endeavoured, even in *this* case, to spiritualize the literal as much as possible, and to blend it with the allegorical.(3) The dualistic theory of emanation held by the Manichæans and Priscillianists was still the antagonist of the doctrine of a creation out of nothing.(4)

---

(1) In his work περὶ γενητῶν. Extracts of it are given by Photius Bibl. cod. 235, p. 301.

(2) *Athan.* contra Arian. Orat. ii. Opp. T. i. p. 336. *Augustine* endeavoured to remove the idea of time from the notion of

God, and at the same time to retain the doctrine, that creation had a beginning, by representing God as the author of time. Conf. xi. 10, ss. c. 13 :...Quæ tempora fuissent, quæ abs te condita non essent? Aut quomodo præterirent, si nunquam fuissent? Cum ergo sis operator omnium temporum, si fuit aliquod tempus, antequam feceras cœlum et terram, cur dicitur, quod ab opere cessabas? Id ipsum enim tempus tu feceras, nec præterire potuerunt tempora, antequam faceres tempora. Si autem ante cœlum et terram nullum erat tempus, cur quæritur, quid tunc faciebas? Non enim erat tunc, ubi non erat tempus. *Nec tu tempore tempora præcedis,* alioquin non omnia tempora præcederes. *Sed præcedis omnia præterita celsitudine semper præsentis æternitatis,* et superas omnia futura, quia illa futura sunt, et cum venerint, præterita erunt; tu autem idem ipse es, et anni tui non deficiunt.—Cf. de civ. Dei vii. 30: xi. 4–6; xii. 15–17.

(3) Thus he said in reference to the six days: Qui dies cujusmodi sint, aut perdifficile nobis, aut etiam impossibile est cogitare, quanto magis dicere, de civ. Dei xi. 6. Concerning the seventh day (ibid. 8.) his views are very nearly those of Origen: Cum vero in die septimo requievit Deus ab omnibus operibus suis et sanctificavit eum, nequaquam est accipiendum *pueriliter,* tamquam Deus laboraverit operando, qui *dixit* et *facta sunt,* verbo intelligibili et sempiterno, non sonabili et temporali. Sed requies Dei requiem significat eorum, qui requiescunt in Deo, sicut lætitia domus lætitiam significat eorum, qui lætantur in domo, etiamsi non eos domus ipsa, sed alia res aliqua lætos facit etc. On the system of chronology, comp. xii. 10.

(4) *Baur,* manichæisches Religionssystem, p. 42, ss: "*The Manichæan system acknowledges no creation properly speaking, but only a mixture, by means of which the two opposite principles so pervade each other, that their product is the existing system of the world, which partakes of the nature of both.*" Comp. the statements of the Manichæan Felix which are there given. —On the Priscillianists, see Orosii Commonitor. ad August. *Neander,* Kirchengeschichte, ii. 3, p. 1488, ss. *Baumgarten-Crusius,* Compend. i. p. 111. [*Gieseler,* i. § 86.]

§ 128.

THE RELATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

As the distinguishing characteristics of each of the persons of the Trinity had been more precisely defined (§ 95.), the question arose among theologians, to which of the three persons the work of creation was to be assigned? In the Apostles' Creed God the Father (without any further distinction) was declared the creator of the world, in the Nicene Creed the Son was said to have taken a part in the creation, and the council of Constantinople asserted the same with regard to the Holy Ghost.(1) *Gregory of Nazianzum* maintained, in accordance with some other theologians of this period, that the work of creation had been brought about by the Son, and completed by the Holy Ghost.(2)

---

(1) Symb. Ap.: Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem cœli et terræ. Comp. what *Rufinus* says on this passage: he shows that all things are created *through* the Son. The Nicene Creed calls the Father παντοκράτορα πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀοράτων ποιητήν, but says in reference to the Son: δι᾽ οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο, τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ. The symbol of Constantinople calls the Holy Spirit τὸ ζωοποιοῦν.

(2) Orat. xxxviii. 9. p. 668:......καὶ τὸ ἐννόημα ἔργον ἦν, λόγῳ συμπληρούμενον καὶ πνεύματι τελειούμενον. He calls the Son also τεχνίτης λόγος. Comp. *Ullmann*, p. 490. Other theologians followed Augustine's example in referring the work of creation to the whole Trinity. Thus *Fulgentius* of Ruspe de trin. c. 8.

§ 129.

DESIGN OF THE UNIVERSE.—PROVIDENCE.—PRESERVATION AND GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.

According to the prevailing opinion of theologians, the world was created not for the sake of God,(1) but of man.(2) In opposition to a mechanical view of the universe, the profound *Augustine* directed attention to the connection subsisting between creation and preservation;(3) but more special care was bestowed during the present period upon the doctrine of providence, on which *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret* in the East, and *Salvian* in the West, composed separate treatises.(4) They took special pains to show, in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, that the providence of God extends to the most minute particulars.(5) *Jerome*, however, did not agree with them, and thinking it derogatory to the Divine Being to exercise such special care respecting the lower creation, maintained that God concerns himself only about the genus, but not about the species.(6) He thus prepared the way for the distinction made by the African bishop *Junilius* (who lived about the middle of the sixth century) between gubernatio generalis and gubernatio specialis, (7) which appeared, in one aspect at least, to substitute an abstract mechanism for the concrete idea of God.

(1) Thus *Augustine* maintained de vera rel. 15. that the angels in serving God do not profit him, but themselves. Deus enim bono alterius non indiget, quoniam a se ipso est.

(2) *Nemesius* de nat. hom. i. p. 30, ss. (ed Oxon. 1671): Ἀπέδειξεν οὖν ὁ Λόγος τὴν τῶν φυτῶν γένεσιν μὴ δι᾽ ἑαυτὴν, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς τροφὴν καὶ σύστασιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ζῶων γεγενημένην, and in reference to the animals he says, p. 34: κοινῆ δὲ πάντα πρὸς θεραπείαν ἀνθρώπων συντελεῖν πέφυκε, καὶ τὰ μὴ ταῖς ἄλλαις χρείαις χρήσιμα) In support of his views he adduces the example of useful domestic animals, and observes with regard to hurtful animals, that they had not been so prior to the fall, and that man possesses even now means sufficient to subdue them. Comp. *Chrys.* hom. πρός τοὺς καταλείψαντας τὴν ἔκκλησίαν, Opp. T. vi. p. 272. (Ed. *Bauermeister* p. 8): Ἥλιος ἀνέτειλε διὰ σὲ, καὶ σελήνη τὴν νύκτα ἐφώτισε, καὶ ποικίλος ἀστέρων ἀνέλαμψε χορός· ἔπνευσαν ἄνεμοι διὰ σὲ, ἔδραμον ποταμοί· σπέρματα ἐβλάστησαν διὰ σὲ, καὶ φῶτα ἀνεδόθη, καὶ τῆς φύσεως ὁ δρόμος τὴν οἰκείαν ἐτήρησε τάξιν, καὶ ἡμέρα ἐφάνη καὶ νὺξ παρῆλθε, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα γέγονε

διὰ σέ. But Chrysostom also asserted that God had created the world δι' ἀγαθότητα μόνην, de prov. i. T. iv. p. 142. Comp. *Aug.* de div. quæst. 28. Opp. T. vi. *Gregor. Nyss.* Or. catech. c. 5. de hominis opificio c. 2. *Lact.* Inst. vii. 4.

(3) His general views on the subject may be seen from de morib. eccles. cath. c. 6; Nullum enim arbitror aliquo religionis nomine teneri, qui non saltem animis nostris divina providentia consuli existimet.—He then objects particularly to the popular notion of a master-builder whose work continues to exist, though he himself withdraws. The world would at once cease to exist, if God were to deprive it of his presence, de genesi ad litt. iv. c. 12. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 27. He defends himself against the charge of Pantheism de civ. Dei vii. 30: Sic itaque administrat omnia, quæ creavit, ut etiam ipsa proprios exercere et agere motus sinat. Quamvis enim nihil esse possint, sine ipso, non sunt quod ipse. "*The world exists not apart from God, everything is in God; this, however, is not to be understood as if God were space itself, but in a manner purely dynamic.*" *Schleiermacher*, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 168. *Gregory* of Nazianzum uses similar language, Orat. xvi. 5, p. 302, see *Ullmann*, p 491.

(4) *Chrys.* 3 books de fato et providentia.—*Theodoret*, 10 orations περὶ τῆς θείας προνοίας.—*Salvianus* de gubernatione Dei s. de prov. Comp. also *Nemesius* de Natura hominis (περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου) c. 42, ss.

(5) This is indirectly proved by *Arnob.* adv. gent. iv. 10, p. 142. (viz. in opposition to polytheism): Cur enim Deus præsit melli uni tantummodo, non præsit cucurbitis, rapis, non cunilæ, nasturtio, non ficis, betaceis, caulibus? Cur sola meruerint ossa tutelam, non meruerint ungues, pili, cæteraque alia, quæ locis posita in obscuris et verecundioribus partibus, et sunt casibus obnoxia plurimis, et curam magis deorum, diligentiamque desiderant? A direct proof is given by *Nemesius*, l. c. c. 44, p. 333: Πάντα γὰρ ἤρτηται τοῦ Θεοῦ θελήματος· καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἀρύεται τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ σωτηρίαν. Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ πεπληθυσμένων ὑπόστασις προνοίας ἐστὶ δεκτικὴ, δῆλον ἐκ τῶν ζώων των ἀρχαῖς τισι καὶ ἡγεμονίας διοικουμένων, ὧν πολλὰ εἴδη· καὶ γὰρ μέλισσαι καὶ μύρμηκες καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν συναγελαζομένων ὑπό τισιν ἡγεμόσι τέτακται, οἷς ἀκολουθεῖ πειθόμενα. Nemesius, however, makes a distinction between *creation* and *providence*, and gives a definition of the latter, c. 42, p. 308: Οὐ γὰρ ταὐτό ἐστι πρόνοια καὶ κτίσις· κτίσεως μεν

γὰρ τὸ καλῶς ποιῆσαι τὰ γινόμενα· προνοίας δὲ τὸ καλῶς ἐπιμεληθῆναι τῶν γενομένων, and c. 43, p. 315: Πρόνοια τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἐκ Θεοῦ εἰς τὰ ὄντα γινομένη ἐπιμέλεια· ὁρίζοντας δὲ καὶ οὕτως αὐτήν· πρόνοιά ἐστι βούλησις Θεοῦ, δι' ἣν πάντα τὰ ὄντα τὴν πρόσφορον διεξαγωγὴν λαμβάνει κ. τ. λ. Generally speaking we find here a complete system of teleology.

(6) *Hier*. Comment. in Abacuc c. 1. (Opp. T. vi. p. 148): Sicut in hominibus etiam per singulos currit Dei providentia: sic in ceteris animalibus generalem quidem dispositionem et ordinem cursumque rerum intelligere possumus; verbi gratia: quomodo nascatur piscium multitudo et vivit in aquis, quomodo reptilia et quadrupedia oriantur in terra et quibus alantur cibis. Ceterum absurdum est ad hoc Dei deducere majestatem, ut sciat per momenta singula, quot nascantur culices, quotve moriantur [comp. on the other hand Matth. x. 29, 30], quæ cimicum et pulicum et muscarum sit multitudo in terra, quanti pisces in mari natent, et qui de minoribus majorum prædæ cedere debeant. Non simus tam fatui adulatores Dei, ut, dum potentiam ejus etiam ad ima detrahimus, *in nos ipsi injuriosi simus* (!), eandem rationabilium quam irrationabilium providentiam esse dicentes.

(7) *Junil.* de partibus legis divinæ, l. ii. c. 3, ss. Bibl. max. PP. T. x. p. 345. General providence manifests itself in the preservation of the genus, and of the condition of all existence; special providence is displayed, 1. in the care of God for angels and men; 2. in that of the angels for men; and, 3. in that of men for themselves.

§ 130.

THEODICY.

The controversy with the Manichæans, whose notions were to some extent adopted by *Lactantius*,(1) rendered necessary a more precise definition of the nature of evil, and such a distinction between physical and moral evil, as would represent the latter as the true source of the former. Hence the evils existing in the world were regarded either (objectively) as the necessary consequence and punishment of sin, or (subjectively) as phenomena which, being good in themselves, assume the appearance of evil only in consequence of our limited knowledge, or the corrupt state of our mind, or through a perverse use of our moral freedom. But the wise and pious, looking forward to that better time which is to come, use those evils as means of advancing in knowledge, and of practising patience.(2)

---

(1) Inst. div. ii. c. 8. In the same place he advances the unsatisfactory notion which even Augustine seems to have entertained (Enchir. ad Laur. c. 27,) that evil would exist though it were merely for the sake of contrast; as if good were good only by the contrast which it forms with bad, and ceased to be so when there is no contrast.

(2) *Athan.* contra gent. c. 7. *Basil M.* in Hexaëm. Hom. ii. 4. Hom. quod Deus non est auctor malorum (the passage should be read in its connection) Opp. T. ii. p. 78, (al. i. p. 361.) *Klose,* p. 54–59. *Greg. Nyss.* orat. catech. c. 6. *Greg. Naz.* orat. xiv. 30, 31. xvi. 5, quoted by *Ullmann,* p. 493. *Chrys.* in 2 Tim. Hom. viii. Opp. xii. 518, e. *Aug.* de civ. Dei xi. 9: Mali enim nulla natura est, sed amissio boni mali nomen accepit. Comp. c. 22. Fire, frost, wild beasts, poison, etc., may all be useful in their proper place, and in connection with the whole; it is only necessary to make such a use of them as accords with their design. Thus poison causes the death of some, but heals others; meat and drink injure only the immoderate......Unde nos admonet divina providentia, non res insipienter vituperare, sed utilitatem rerum diligenter inquirere, et ubi nostrum ingenium vel firmitas deficit, ita credere occultam, sicut erant quædam, quæ vix potuimus invenire; quia et ipsa utilitatis occultatio, aut humilitatis exercitatio est aut elationis attritio; cum omnino natura nulla sit malum, nomenque hoc non sit nisi privationis boni. Sed a terrenis usque ad cœlestia et a visibilibus usque ad invisibilia sunt aliis alia bona meliora; ad hoc inæqualia, ut essent omnia etc. Comp. de vera rel. c. 12. Evils are beneficial as punishments, ibid. c. 15:...amaritudine pœnarum erudiamur. On the question why the righteous have to suffer as well as the unrighteous? see de civ. Dei i. 8—10. Christians rise above all trials only by love to God: *toto mundo est omnino sublimior mens inhærens Deo,* de morib. eccles. cath. c. 11.

This seems to be the turning-point of every theodicy (Rom. viii. 28.)

§ 131.

ANGELOLOGY AND ANGELOLATRY.

J. P. Carpzovii, varia historia Angelicorum ex Epiphanio et aliorum veterum monumentis eruta. Helmst. 1772. 4. *Keil*, Opuscula academica, ii. p. 548, ss.

Since the ideas of generation and procession from the Father had been exclusively applied to the Son and the Holy Ghost, it was distinctly acknowledged that the angels are creatures, and not emanations from the essence of God.(1) Nevertheless they were still regarded as highly gifted creatures who are far superior to mankind.(2) Adoration was rendered to them; but *Ambrose* was the only Father during this period—and he did it merely in a passing remark—who recommended the invocation of angels to Christians.(3) But both the prohibition of the worship of angels (angelolatry) by the synod of Laodicea (about the middle of the fourth century), and the testimony of *Theodoret* prove, that such a worship must have been practised in some parts of the East (it was perhaps borrowed from earlier ages.)(4) *Theodoret*, as well as *Augustine*, opposed the adoration, or at least the invocation of angels, which was disapproved of even by *Gregory I.*, who was desirous of confining it to the Old Testament dispensation.(5) But the practice of dedicating churches to angels,(6) which was favoured by emperors and bishops, would necessarily confirm the people in their belief, that angels heard and answered prayer, notwithstanding all dogmatic explanations. With regard to the dogmatic definition concerning the nature of angels, *Gregory* asserted that they were created prior to the rest of the world; others, *e. g.* Augustine, dated their existence from the first day of creation.(7)

In the work of *Pseudo-Dionysius* (de hierarchia cœlesti) which, though composed during the present period, did not come into general use till the next, the angels were systematically divided into three classes and nine orders.(8)

(1) *Lact.* Inst. iv. c. 8: Magna inter Dei filium et *cæteros* [sic] *angelos* differentia est. Illi enim ex Deo taciti spiritus exierunt.........Ille vero cum voce ac sono ex Dei ore processit.

(2) *Basil, M.* de Spir. S. c. 16, calls the angels ἀέριον πνεῦμα, πῦρ ἄϋλον according to Ps. civ. 4, and hence ascribes to them a certain corporeity. *Gregory of Nazianzum* says, Orat. vi. 12, p. 187:.........φῶς εἰσι καὶ αὐταὶ τελείου φωτὸς ἀπαυγάσματα. According to Orat. xxviii. 31, p. 521, ss. the angels are servants of the Divine will, powerful by strength, partly original and partly derived, moving from place to place, everywhere present, and ready to assist all, not only by reason of their zeal to serve, but also on account of the lightness of their bodies; different parts of the world are assigned to different angels, or placed under their dominion (Orat. xlii. 9, p. 755, and 27, p. 768), as *he* knows who has ordained and arranged all things. They have all *one* object in view (Orat. vi. 12, p. 187), and act all according to the *one* will of the creator of the universe. They praise the Divine greatness, and ever behold the eternal glory, not that God may thus be glorified, but that unceasing blessings may flow even upon those beings who stand nearest to God. Comp. *Ullmann*, p. 494, 95. *Augustine* calls the angels *sancti angeli*, de civ. Dei xi. 9. *Fulgentius of Ruspe*, de trin. c. 8, on the authority of great and learned men, asserts, that they are composed of body and spirit; they know God by the latter, and appear to men by means of the former.

(3) *Ambrose* de viduis, cap. ix. § 55: Videtis enim quod magno peccato obnoxia minus idonea sit quæ pro a precetur, certe quæ pro se impetret. Adhibeat igitur ad medicum alios precatores. Ægri enim, nisi ad eos aliorum precibus medicus fuerit invitatus, pro se rogare non possunt. Infirma est caro, mens ægra est, et peccatorum vinculis impedita, ad medici illius sedem debite non potent explicare vestigium. *Obsecrandi sunt angeli, qui nobis ad præsidium dati sunt:* martyres obsecrandi, quorum videmur nobis quoddam corporis pignore patrocinium vindi-

care. Possunt pro peccatis rogare nostris, qui proprio sanguine, etiamsi quæ habuerunt, peccata luerunt....Non erubescamus *eos intercessores nostræ infirmitatis* adhibere, quia et ipsi infirmitatem corporis, etiam cum vincerent, cognoverunt. Nevertheless he soon after counsels men to the direct invocation of the Divine physician himself.

(2) *Theodoret* ad Col. ii. 18, and iii. 17, (quoted by *Munscher* von Cölln, i. 86.) Conc. Laod. (about the year 363.) Can. 35. *Mansi*, ii. p. 570. See *Fuchs*, ii. p. 330, ss. *Bruns*, Bibl. eccles. i. p. 77. *Gieseler*, Kirchengesch. i. § 99, note 32–34, § 121, note 7: Ὅτι οὐ δεῖ χριστιανοὺς ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀπιέναι καὶ ἀγγέλους ὀνομάζειν καὶ συνάξεις ποιεῖν· ἅπερ ἀπηγόρευται. It is worthy of notice that Dionysius translates *angulos* instead of *angelos*.

(5) *Theodoret*, l. c. *Aug.* de vera rel. c. 55: Neque enim et nos videndo *angelos* beati sumus, sed videndo *veritatem*, qua etiam ipsos diligimus angelos, et his congratulamur........Quare honoramus eos caritate, non servitute. Nec eis templa construimus; nolunt enim, se sic honorari a nobis, quia nos ipsos cum boni sumus, templa summi Dei esse noverunt. Recte itaque scribitur (Rev. xxii.) hominem ab angelo prohibitum ne se adoraret, sed unum Deum, sub quo ei esset et ille conservus. Comp. contra Faust. xx. 21. Conf. x. 42, and other passages quoted by *Keil*, l. c. p. 552. *Gregory M.* in Cant. Cant. c. 8. Opp. T. ii. p. 454. (*Chrysost.* de precat. hom. i. Opp. T. i. p. 743, A.)

(6) Constantine the Great had dedicated a church at Constantinople (Μιχαήλιον) to St. Michael, Sozom. hist. eccl. ii. 3., and *Theodoret*, (l. c.) says in reference to the Phrygians and Pisidians; μέχρι δὲ τοῦ νῦν εὐκτήρια τοῦ ἁγίου Μιχαὴλ παρ' ἐκείνοις καὶ τοῖς ὁμόροις ἐκείνων ἔστιν ἰδεῖν. The Emperor Justinian, and Avitus, bishop of Vienne, also dedicated churches to Angels.

(7) *Greg. Naz.* xxxviii. 9, p. 668. All the angels together, form, in his opinion, the κόσμος νοητός, as distinct from the κόσμος αἰσθητός, ὑλικὸς καὶ ὁρώμενος. Comp. *Ullmann*, p. 497. *Augustine* expresses himself differently de civ. Dei xi. 9. In his opinion, they are the light which was created in the beginning before all other creatures; at the same time, he so explains the dies unus (instead of primus יוֹם אֶחָד), that this *one* day of light included the other days of creation, and then continues: Cum enim dixit Deus: *fiat lux, et facta est lux*, si recte in hac luce creatio intel-

ligitur angelorum, profecto facti sunt participes lucis æternæ, quod [quæ] est ipsa incommutabilis sapientia Dei, per quam facta sunt omnia, quem dicimus unigenitum Dei filium, ut ea luce illuminati, qua creati, fierent lux, et vocarentur dies participatione incommutabilis lucis et dici, quod est verbum Dei, per quod et ipsi et omnia facta sunt. Lumen quippe verum, quod illuminat omnem hominem in hunc mundum venientem, hoc illuminat et omnem angelum mundum, ut sit lux non in se ipso, sed in Deo: a quo si avertitur angelus, fit immundus.

(8) Some of the earlier theologians, *e. g. Basil the Great*, and *Gregory of Nazianzum*, founded different orders of angels on the various names given to them in Scripture. Bas. de Spir. S. c. 16. Greg. Orat. xxviii. 31, p. 521, mentions ἀγγέλους τινὰς καὶ ἀρχαγγέλους, θρόνους, κυριότητας, ἀρχὰς, ἐξουσίας, λαμπρότητας, ἀναβάσεις, νοερὰς δυνάμεις, ἢ νόας. He does not, however, distinctly state by what these different classes are distinguished, since he thinks these internal relations of the world of spirits beyond the reach of human apprehension; *Ullmann*, p. 494. Comp. *Augustine* Enchirid. ad Laur. 58: Quomodo autem se habeat beatissima illa et superna societas, quæ ibi sint differentiæ personarum, ut cum omnes tamquam generali nomine angeli nuncupentur...... ego me ista ignorare confiteor. Sed nec illud quidem certum habeo, utrum ad eandem societatem pertineant sol et luna et cuncta sidera etc. But *Pseudo-Dionysius*, who lived nearly a century after Augustine, seems to have understood the subject much better; in his Hierarchia cœlestis (Ed. *Lansselii*, Par. 1615 fol.) c. 6, he divided the whole number of angels into three classes (hierarchies), and subdivided each class into three orders (τάγματα): i. 1. Θρόνοι, 2. Χερουβίμ, 3. Σεραφίμ, ii. 4. κυριότητες. 5. ἐξουσίαι, 6. δυνάμεις. iii. 7. ἀρχαί, 8. ἀρχάγγελοι, 9. ἄγγελοι. He nevertheless observed, that the last term, as well as δυνάμεις οὐράνιαι, was common to all (c. 11.)[a] *Gregory the Great* followed him (Hom. in Ezekiel, xxxiv. 7. Opp. Tom. i. p. 1603, al. ii. p. 477.), and mentioned the following nine classes: Angeli, Archangeli, Virtutes, Potestates, Principatus, Dominationes,

---

[a] Pseudo-Dionysius, however, cap. 1, and 2,) endeavoured to remove the gross and sensuous ideas of the body of the angels, and designated the common terminology as ἀπότομον τῶν ἀγγελικῶν ὀνομάτων σκευήν (durum angeliorum nominum apparatum), comp. his mystical interpretation of the images of angels in cap. 15.

Throni, Cherubim atque Seraphim, which he brought into connection with the nine precious stones spoken of in Ezek. xxviii. 13.

§ 132.

THE SAME SUBJECT CONTINUED.

Metaphysical definitions of the nature of Angels were of less importance in the religious-moral, consequently dogmatic point of view, than the question whether angels, like men, possessed a free will, and were capable of sinning? It was generally admitted that this had been the case prior to the fall of the evil angels. But theologians did not agree in their opinions respecting another point, viz. whether the good angels who at first resisted temptation, will never yield to it, or whether it is possible that they too should fall into sin? *Gregory of Nazianzum,* and still more decidedly *Cyrill of Jerusalem,* pronounced in favour of the latter view,(1) *Augustine* adopted the former.(2)

(1) *Gregory* thought that the angels were not ἀκίνητοι, but δυσκίνητοι to evil (Orat. xxviii. 31, p. 521), and imagined that this would necessarily follow from the fact that Lucifer once fell, Orat. xxxviii. 9, p. 668. Orat. xlv. 5, p. 849. *Ullmann,* p. 496. Comp. also *Basil the Great* de Spir. S. c. 16.) But *Cyrill* of Jerusalem (Cat. ii. 10.) insisted that the predicate "sinless" should be applied to none but Christ, and maintained that the angels too stood in need of pardon. Comp. *Lactantius* Inst. vii. 20; Angeli Deum metuunt, quia *castigari* ab eo possunt inenarrabili quodam modo.

(2) *Aug.* de ver. rel. i. 13: Fatendum est enim, et angelos natura esse mutabiles, si solus Deus est incommutabilis; sed ea voluntate, qua magis Deum quam se diligunt, *firmi et stabiles manent in illo* et fruuntur majestate ipsius, ei uni libentissime subditi. According to the Enchiridion, c. 28. the good angels received after the fall of the evil ones what they had not had before, viz. certam scientiam, qua essent de sua sempiterna et nunquam casura stabilitate securi; this idea is evidently in accordance with his anthropological views on the donum perseve-

rantiæ. and is more prominently brought forward de civ. Dei xi. 13: Quis enim catholicus christianus ignorat nullum novum diabolum ex bonis angelis ulterius futurum: sicut nec istum in societatem bonorum angelorum ulterius rediturum? Veritas quippe in Evangelio sanctis fidelibusque promittit, quod erunt æquales Angelis Dei? quibus etiam promittitur, quod ibunt in vitam æternam. Porro autem si nos certi sumus nunquam nos ex illa immortali felicitate casuros, illi vero certi non sunt: jam potiores, non æquales eis erimus: sed quia nequaquam Veritas fallit, et æquales eis erimus, profecto etiam ipsi certi sunt suæ felicitatis æternæ, Comp. Pseudo-Dionys. c. 7. *Gregory the Great* also asserted that the good angels have obtained the confirmatio in bono as a Divine gift, Ezech. lib. i. hom. 7. Mor. v. c. 38, and xxxvi. c. 7. *Lau*, p. 362.

§ 133.

DEVIL AND DEMONS.

According to the prevailing opinion of the age *pride* was the true cause of the fall of the evil spirits.(1) Almost all the theologians of this period, with the exception of *Lactantius*, whose notions resembled those of the dualistic Manichæans,(2) regarded the devil as a being of limited power,(3) whose seductions Christian believers might at any time resist.(4) *Didymus of Alexandria*, and *Gregory of Nyssa* ventured—though with great caution—to revive the notion of Origen, that there was still hope of the final conversion of the devil.(5) *Cyrill of Jerusalem, Jerome*, and *Augustine* combated this opinion, which was condemned in the sixth century by the Emperor Justinian, together with the other errors of Origen.(6) It was moreover supposed, that demonaical powers were still brought into operation,(7) but were most effectually resisted by the name of Christ, and the sign of the cross.(8)

---

(1) *Eus.* demonstr. evang. iv. 9. *Aug.* de vera rel. i. 13: Ille autem angelus magis se ipsum, quam Deum diligendo subditus ei esse noluit et *intumuit per superbiam*, et a summa essentia

defecit et lapsus est, et ob hoc minus est quam fuit, quia eo quod minus erat frui voluit, quum magis voluit sua potentia frui, quam Dei. De catechiz. rudibus § 30: *superbiendo* deseruit obedientiam Dei et Diabolus factus est. De civ. D. xii. c. 6: Cum vero causa miseriæ malorum angelorum quæritur, ea merito occurrit, quod ab illo qui summe est aversi ad se ipsos conversi sunt, qui non summe sunt: et hoc vitium quid aliud quam superbia nuncupatur? *Initium* quippe *omnis peccati superbia.* Comp. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 28. *Envy* was added to *pride*, comp. *Gregory of Nazianz.* Orat. xxxvi. 5, p. 637, and vi. 13, p. 187. *Ullmann*, p. 499. *Gregory of Nyssa*, Orat. catech. c. 6: Ταῦτα δὲ [viz. the excellence of the first man] τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν φθόνον πάθους ὑπεκκαύματα ἦν. *Cassian*, Collat. viii. 6, makes mention of both superbia and invidia.—The idea of lasciviousness was put more and more into the background. *Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, *Cyrill* of Alexandria, *Augustine*, and *Cassian*, gave also a more correct interpretation of the passage in Gen. vi. 2, which was misunderstood by earlier theologians; we may, however observe, that *Eusebius* (præp. ev. v. 4), *Ambrose* de Noë et arca, c. 4), and *Sulpicius Severus*, (Hist. sacra, i. 3,) explained it in a sense similar to that which was formerly attached to it (§ 52, note 3.) Comp. *Chrys.* hom. in Gen. xxii. Opp. T. ii. p. 216. *Theodoret* in Gen. quæst. 47. Opp. T. i. p. 58: 'Εμβρόντητοι ὄντες καὶ ἄγαν ἠλίθιοι, ἀγγέλους τούτους ἀπέλαβον, and fab. hær. ep. v. 7. Opp. iv. p. 402: Παραπληξίας γὰρ ἐσχάτης τὸ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις προσάψαι τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀκολασίαν. *Cyrill Al.* contra Anthropomorphitas, c. 17, (Opp. T. vi. p. 384,) contra Julian lib. ix. p. 296. 97. *Aug.* de civ. Dei xv. 23, quæst. 3, in Gen. Cassian Coll. viii. c. 20, 21. [Comp. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 90–92.] *Hilary* (in Ps. cxxxii. p. 403,) mentions the earlier interpretation, but without approval. *Philastrius*, on the contrary, numbers it among the heresies, hær. 107, (de gigantibus tempore Noë.)

(2) Inst. ii. 8. Previous to the creation of the world God created a spirit like unto himself (the Logos), who possessed the attributes of the Father; but after that he created another spirit, in whom the Divine seed did not remain (in quo indoles divinæ stirpis non permansit.) Moved by *envy* he apostatized, and changed his name (contrarium sibi nomen ascivit.) The Greek writers call him διάβολος, the Latin criminator, quod crimina, in quæ ipse illicit, ad Deum deferat (hence the appellation

obtrectator.) He envies especially his predecessor (the first-born), because he continued to enjoy the favour of God.—Lactantius thus agrees with the other theologians in supposing that envy had been the cause of the fall. But his peculiar manner of representing Satan, as it were, as the second Son of God, and of drawing a parallel between him and the first-born, certainly reminds us of Gnostico-Manichæan notions. In another passage (which, though now wanting in many MSS., was probably at an early period omitted to save the reputation of Lactantius) he calls the Logos the right, and Satan the left hand of God. If the passage in question were genuine, it would go to prove very clearly, that the views of Lactantius on this subject were essentially Manichæan, though the unity of the Father would be still preserved above the contrast of Logos and Satan; but the notion last mentioned would justly expose its author to the charge of Arianism. This seems to have been felt by those critics who omitted the above passage. Comp. the note of *Cellarius* in the edition of *Bünemann*, i. p. 218. Comp. Cap. ix. where the term *Antitheus* occurs, (Arnob. contra gent. iv. 12, and *Orelli* on that passage.) *Augustine* opposed the Manichæan notion, c. Faust. 21. 1. and 2.[a]

(3) *Gregory the Great* calls him a stupid animal; for he entertains hopes respecting heaven without being able to obtain it, and is caught in his own net, Mor. xxxiii. c. 15. *Lau*, p. 364.

(4) *Gregory of Nazianz*. Orat. xl. 10, p. 697, makes special mention of the *water of baptism*, and the *Spirit* as the means, by which to quench the arrows of the wicked. Satan had no power over Christ; deceived by his human appearance, he took him for a mere man. But the Christian who is united to Christ by faith, can likewise resist him, Orat. xxiv. 10, p. 443: Παχύτεραι γὰρ αἱ καθαραὶ ψυχαί καὶ θεοειδεῖς πρὸς θήραν τυῦ ἐνεργοῦντος, κἂν ὅτι μάλιστα σοφιστικὸς ᾖ καὶ ποικίλος τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν. The assertion of *Hilary* in Ps. cxli. p. 541: quidquid inquinatum homines gerunt, a Diabolo suggeritur, met with opposition on the part of *Gennadius* de eccles. dogm. c. 48: Non omnes malæ cogitationes nostræ semper Diaboli instinctu excitantur, sed aliquoties ex nostri arbitrii motu emergunt. Comp. also *Chrys.* de

---

[a] The sense of the very appropriate passage quoted by *Baumgarten-Crusius*, p. 987: Diabolus non simpliciter Deus est, sed illis Deus existit, qui illum Christo anteponunt (according to 2 Cor. iv. 4,) is the same, but not the words.

prov. c. 5. Opp. iv. 150. *Aug.* de advers. leg. ii. 12, and elsewhere.

(5) *Didym.* Enarr. Epp. cathol. e vers. lat. Bibl. PP. max. T. iv. p. 325, in commmenting on 1 Pet. iii. 22, merely said, that Christ had accomplished the work of redemption for all rational beings (cuncta rationalia). *Gregory of Nyssa* expressed himself more explicitly, orat. catech. c. 26, (see in *Münscher* von Cölln, i. p. 97), but Germanus contested the genuineness of the passage in Photius Cod. 233. Even *Orosius* complained in a letter to Augustine (Opp. Aug. T. viii.), that some men revived the erroneous views of Origen on this point.

(6) *Cyrill* of Jerusalem, Cat. iv. p. 51, ascribed to the devil an obstinate heart and incorrigible temper; comp. *Augustine* ad Orosium contra Priscillian. et Orig. c. 5, ss. Opp. T. viii. p. 433, ss. de civ. D. xxi. 17:......Qua in re misericordior profecto fuit Origenes, qui et ipsum Diabolum atque angelos ejus post graviora pro meritis et diuturniora supplicia ex illis cruciatibus eruendos atque sociandos sanctis angelis credidit. Sed illum et propter hoc et propter alia nonnulla...non immerito reprobavit ecclesia. He shows, that the final deliverance of the devil necessarily follows from the doctrine of the remission of the punishments of hell; but the more this notion is incorrect (in reference to the word of God), the more agreeable and charitable it appears to men. [*Jerome,* ep. 84, ad Pammach. et Ocean. p. 528. Ep. 124. ad Avitum, p. 920.] Concerning the final condemnation of Origen's opinion, see *Mansi,* T. ix. p. 399. 518. According to *Gregory the Great*, the devil still enjoys a potentia sublimitatis, Mor. xxiv. 20; xxxii. c. 12, 15. He rejoices in sowing evil, and is possessed of considerable power, which, however, is broken by Christ. Final punishment will be inflicted upon him after the general judgment, comp. *Lau,* p. 365, ss.

(7) *Eus.* præp. ev. iii. c. 14–16. *Aug.* de civ. D. ii. c. 24; x. 21: Moderatis autem præfinitisque temporibus, etiam potestas permissa dæmonibus, ut hominibus quos possident excitatis inimicitias adversus Dei civitatem tyrannice exerceant.—*Posidonius,* a physician, combated (according to Philostorgius hist. eccl. viii. c. 10), the current opinion, that madness proceeds from demoniacal influences, asserting that Οὐχὶ δαιμόνων ἐπιθέσει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκβακχεύεσθαι, ὑγρῶν δέ τινων κακοχυμίαν τὸ πάθος ἐργάζεσθαι, μηδὲ γὰρ εἶναι παράπαν ἰσχὺν δαιμόνων, ἀνθρώπων φύσιν ἐπηρεάζουσαν. The popular view nevertheless continued to be defended in most theological systems.

(8) *Athanæ.* de incarn. verbi dei c. 48. Opp. T. i. p. 89. *Cyrill* Hier. Cat. xiii. 36: [ὁ σταυρὸς] σημεῖον πιστῶν καὶ φόβος δαιμόνων...... ὅταν γὰρ ἴδωσι τὸν σταυρὸν, ὑπομιμνήσκονται τοῦ ἐσταυρωμένου· φοβοῦνται τὸν συντρίψοντα τὰς κεφαλὰς τοῦ δράκοντος. *Cassian* Coll. viii. 19, distinguishes the true power of faith which defeats the demons, from the supernatural power, which even the ungodly may exert upon evil spirits, since these obey them as servants (familiares). The poem of Severus Sanctus Endelechius de mortibus bonum contains a lively description of the supernatural efficacy of the sign of the cross against demoniacal influences, even in reference to the animal kingdom. (Comp. the edition of *Piper*, Gött. 1835. 8; a number of other passages referring to the point in question are quoted from the works of the Fathers in the introduction to the said edit.)

V. 105, ss.: Signum, quod perhibent esse crucis Dei,
Magnis qui colitur solus in urbibus,
Christus, perpetui gloria numinis,
Cujus filius unicus:
  Hoc signum mediis frontibus additum
Cunctarum pecudum certa salus fuit.
Sic vero Deus hoc nomine præpotens
Salvator vocitatus est.
  Fugit continuo sæva lues greges,
Morbis nil licuit. Si tamen hunc Deum
Exorare velis, credere sufficit:
Votum sola fides juvat.

3. *Soteriology.*

§ 134.

REDEMPTION THROUGH CHRIST.

Döderlein, de redemtione a potestate Diaboli, insigni Christi beneficio (diss. inaugur. 1774. 75.) in his Opuscula academica Jena 1789. *Baur*, die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung, p. 67–118.

The doctrine of Satanic agency occupied during this period a prominent place in the scheme of redemption, inasmuch as *Gregory of Nyssa* and other theologians, some of whom belonged to the western church, revived the former notion, that God, in order to save men, had defrauded the devil by a dishonest exchange.(1) This idea, however, met with decided opposition on the part of *Gregory of Nazianzum*, though *he* too admitted that the devil was deceived by God.(2) But the notion of a debt paid to God, which was first propounded by *Athanasius*,(3) gained increasingly ground. It was still farther carried out by some rhetorical theologians, who asserted, that Christ had more than paid the debt.(4) The idea in question, however, was not as yet received in a doctrinal form. Others looked at the death of Christ from what we might call the subjective point of view, *i. e.* they either interpreted it in a mystico-symbolical way,(5) or they showed its importance in its bearing upon morals.(6) In connection with such views it was moreover supposed, that the redemption of the world was effected not only by the death of the Saviour, but by the entire manifestation and life of the Son of God.(7) Free scope was as yet left to investigations respecting the particular *mode* of redemption.(8)

(1) *Gregory of Nyssa*, Orat. cat. c. 22–26. The train of his argument is as follows: Men have come under the dominion of the devil by sin. Jesus offered himself to the devil as the ransom for which he should release all others. The crafty devil assented, because he cared more for the *one* Jesus who was so much superior to him, than for all the rest. But notwithstanding his craft he was deceived, since he could not retain Jesus in his power. It was, as it were, a deception on the part of God[a] (ἀπάτη τίς ἐστι τρόπον τινά,) that Jesus veiled his divine nature, which the devil would have feared, by means of his humanity, and thus deceived the devil by the appearance of flesh. But Gregory allows such a deception according to the jus talionis; the devil had first deceived men, for the purpose of seducing them; the design of God in deceiving the devil was to redeem

---

[a] The close affinity between this assertion and Docetism, which ever and anon endeavoured to make its appearance, is very plain. See *Baur*, l. c. p. 82, 83.

mankind. (Gregory's argument looks very much like the well-known maxim "that the end sanctifies the means."—This somewhat dramatic representation of the present subject includes that other more profound idea carried out with much ingenuity in many of the odd legends of the middle ages, that the devil, notwithstanding his subtility, is at last outwitted by the wisdom of God, and appears in comparison with it as a stupid devil.) Comp. *Ambrose* in Ev. Luc. Opp. iii. Col. 10. i.: Oportuit *hanc fraudem* Diabolo fieri, ut susciperet corpus Dominus Jesus, et corpus hoc corruptibile, corpus infirmum, ut crucifigeretur ex infirmitate. *Rufinus*, expos. p. 21: Nam sacramentum illud susceptæ carnis hanc habet causam, ut divina filii Dei virtus velut hamus quidam habitu humanæ carnis obtectus......principem mundi invitare possit ad agonem: cui ipse carnem suam velut escam tradidit, ut hamo eum divinitatis intrinsecus teneret insertum et effusione immaculati sanguinis, qui peccati maculam nescit, omnium peccata deleret, eorum duntaxat, qui cruore ejus postes fidei suæ significassent. Sicuti ergo hamum esca conseptum si piscis rapiat, non solum escam cum hamo non removet, sed ipse de profundo esca aliis futurus educitur: ita et is, qui habebat mortis imperium, rapuit quidem in mortem corpus Jesu, non sentiens in eo hamum divinitatis inclusum; sed ubi devoravit, hæsit ipse continuo, et disruptis inferni claustris, velut de profundo extractus traditur, ut esca ceteris fiat (in allusion to certain passages of Scripture, especially to Job: Adduces draconem in hamo et pones capistrum circa nares ejus,) *Leo M.* sermo xxii. 3. *Greg. M.* in Evv. L. ii. Hom. 25. 8. quoted by *Münscher* von Cölln, i. p. 431, (comp. *Lau*, l. c. p. 445, ss.) and *Isidore Hispal.* Sent. lib. iii. dist. 19, (illusus est Diabolus morte Domini quasi avis) quoted by *Baur*, p. 79.

The theologians of this period differed in so far in their opinions, as some adopted only the more general notion of the power which the devil possessed over men, while others (especially Augustine) conceded to the devil a real right; comp. *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, p. 68, ss.

(2) Orat. xlii. p. 691, C: "We were under the dominion of the wicked one, inasmuch as we were sold unto sin, and exchanged pleasures for vileness. If it now be true that a ransom is always paid to him who is in the possession of the thing for which it is due, I would ask, to whom was it paid in this case? and for what reason? Perhaps to Satan himself? But it would

be a shame to think so (φεῦ τῆς ὕβρεως.) For in that case the robber had not only received *from* God, but God himself (in Christ) as a ransom and an exceedingly great recompense of his tyranny......Or is it paid to the Father himself? But in the first place, it might be asked, how could that be, since God did not hold us in bondage? And again, how could we satisfactorily explain *that the Father delighted in the blood of the only begotten Son?* since he did not even accept the offer of Isaac, but substituted the sacrifice of a ram in the place of a rational being? Or is it not evident, that the Father received the ransom, not because he demanded or needed it, but on account of the Divine economy (διὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν), and because man is to be sanctified by the incarnation of God; that having subdued the tyrant, he might deliver and reconcile us to himself by the intercession of his Son?" See *Ullmann*, p. 456, 57. Gregory was nevertheless disposed to admit some artifice on the part of Christ in the contest in which he conquered Satan. "This consisted in this, that Christ assumed the form of man, in consequence of which the devil thought, that he had only to do with a being like ourselves, while the power and glory of the Godhead dwelt in him." Orat. xxxix. 13, p. 685. *Ullmann*, l. c.

(3) De incarnat. c. 7, ss. God had threatened to punish transgressors with death, and thus could not but fulfil his threatening: Οὐκ ἀληθὴς γὰρ ἦν ὁ θεὸς, εἰ, εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ ἀποθνήσκειν ἡμᾶς, μὴ ἀπέθνησκεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος. κ. τ. λ. But, on the other hand, it was not in accordance with the character of God that rational beings, to whom he had imparted his own spirit (Logos), should fall from their first state in consequence of an imposition practised upon them by the devil. This was quite as contrary to the goodness of God (οὐκ ἄξιον γὰρ ἦν τῆς ἀγαθότητος τοῦ θεοῦ,) as it would have been contrary to his justice and veracity, not to punish the transgressor. When the Logos perceived that nothing but death could save man from ruin, he assumed a human body, because the Logos himself, *i. e.* the eternal Son of God, could not die. He offered his human nature as a sacrifice for all, and fulfilled the law by his death. By it he also destroyed the power of the devil (ἠφάνιζε τὸν θάνατον τῇ προσφορᾷ τοῦ καταλλήλου, c. p, p. 54), etc. Comp. *Möhlers*, Athanasius, i. p. 157. *Baur*, p. 94, ss. Concerning the similar, though more general notions of *Basil the Great* (Hom. de gratiar. actione—Hom. in Ps. xlviii. and xxviii.—de Spir. Sancto 15,) comp. *Klose*, p. 65. *Cyrill* also says, Cat. xiii. 33: Ἐχθροί

ἦμεν θεοῦ δι' ἁμαρτίας, καὶ ὥρισεν ὁ θεός τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα ἀποθνήσκειν· ἔδει οὖν ἓν ἐκ τῶν δύο γενέσθαι, ἢ ἀληθεύοντα θεὸν πάντας ἀνελεῖν ἢ φιλανθρωπευόμενον παραλῦσαι τὴν ἀπόφασιν. Ἀλλὰ βλέπε θεοῦ σοφίαν· ἐτήρησεν καὶ τῇ ἀποφάσει τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, κ. τ. λ. *Eus.* dem. ev. x. 1. *Cyr. Alex.* de recta fide ad Regin. Opp. T. v. P. ii. p. 132, in ev. Joh. Opp. T. iv. p. 114. [Comp. *Hilary* in Ps. liii. 12: Passio suscepta voluntarie est, officio ipsa satisfactura pœnali: *Ambrose* de fuga Sæc. c. 7: (Christus) suscepit mortem ut impleretur sententia, satisfieret indicato per maledictum carnis peccatricis usque ad mortem.]

(4) *Cyr. Hier.* l. c.: Οὐ τοσοῦτον ἡμάρτομεν, ὅσον ἐδικαιοπράγησεν ὁ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τεθεικώς. *Chrys.* in Ep. ad Rom. hom. x. 17: Ὥσπερ εἴ τις ὀβολοὺς δέκα ὀφείλοντά τινα εἰς δεσμωτήριον ἐμβάλοι, οὐκ αὐτὸν δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκα καὶ παιδία, καὶ οἰκέτας δι' αὐτόν· ἐλθὼν δε ἕτερος μὴ τοὺς δέκα ὀβολοὺς καταβύλοι μόνον, ἀλλὰ μύρια χρυσοῦ τάλαντα χαρίσαιτο, καὶ εἰς βασιλικὰς εἰσαγάγοι τὸν δεσμώτην.........οὕτω καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν γέγονε· πολλῷ γὰρ πλείονα ὧν ὀφείλομεν κατέβαλεν ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ τοσούτῳ πλείονα, ὅσῳ πρὸς ῥανίδα μικρὰν πέλαγος ἄπειρον. On similar ideas of *Leo the Great*, as well as concerning his entire theory of redemption, see *Griesbach*, Opuscula, p. 98, ss.

(5) Thus *Gregory* of Nazianzum says, Orat. xxiv. 4, p. 439: He has ascended the cross, and taken me with him, to nail my sin on it, to triumph over the serpent, to sanctify the tree, to overcome lust, to lead Adam to salvation, and to restore the fallen image of God."......Orat. xlv. 28, p. 867. "God became man, and died, that we might live: we have died with him, to be purified; we are raised from the dead with him, since we have died with him; we are glorified with him, because we have risen with him from the grave." *Ullmann*, p. 450. Comp. Orat. xxxvi. p. 580, quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 435, and the passages cited there from *Hilary*, de Trin. ii. 24, and *Augustine* de Trinitate iv. 12, [*Athan.* de Incarn. c. 44. *Greg. Nyss.* Orat. cat. c. 16, 32.]

(6) It is worthy of notice, that especially *Augustine* on practical grounds, brought this ethical import of the death of Christ very prominently forward (to counterbalance, as it were, the theory of salvation which is so easily misunderstood:) Tota itaque vita ejus disciplina morum fuit (de vera rel. c. 16.) Christ died, in order that no one might be afraid of death, nor even of the most cruel manner of putting persons to death, de fide et symb. c. 6. de divers. quæst. qu. 25. (Opp. T. vi. p. 7.) The

love of Christ displayed in his death shall constrain us to love him in return, de catech. rud. c. 4: Christus pro nobis mortuus est. Hoc autem ideo, quia finis præcepti et plenitudo legis charitas est, ut et nos invicem diligamus, et quemadmodum ille pro nobis animam suam posuit, sic et nos pro fratribus animam ponamus.........Nulla est enim major ad amorem invitatio, quam prævenire amando, et nimis durus est animus, qui dilectionem si nolebat impendere, nolit rependere. Comp. *Lact.* Inst. div. iv. 23, ss. *Bas. M.* de Spir. S. c. 15.

(7) Comp. the passage quoted from Athanasius in note 3. *Gregory of Nyssa* also says, (Orat. catech. c. 27), that not only the death of Christ had effected the redemption of man, but also the circumstance that he preserved a pure disposition in all the moments of his life:...μολυνθείσης τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ζωῆς, (τὸν Χριστὸν) ἐν ἀρχῇ τε καὶ τελευτῇ καὶ τοῖς διὰ μέσου πᾶσιν ἔδει διὰ πάντων γενέσθαι τὴν ἐκπλύνουσαν δύναμιν, καὶ μὴ τῷ μέν τι θεραπεῦσαι τῷ καθαρσίῳ, τὸ δὲ περιϊδεῖν ἀθεράπευτον. *Augustine* de vera rel. c. 26, represents Christ as the second Adam, and contrasts him as the homo justitiæ with the homo peccati; as sin and ruin are the effects of our connection with Adam, so redemption is the effect of a living union with Christ. Comp. de libero arbitrio iii. 10, de consensu evang. i. c. 35, where he places the real nature of redemption in the manifestation of the Godman. The design of Christ's incarnation is briefly but concisely stated by *Gregory the Great*, Mor. xxi. 6: Ad hoc Dominus apparuit in carne, ut humanum vitam admonendo excitaret, exemplo præbendo accenderet, moriendo redimeret, resurgendo repararet, comp. *Lau*, p. 435. Hence *Baur* says, l. c. p. 109, 10: "*The reconciliation of man to God, the incarnation of God in Christ, and the union of the Divine with the human, which is realized by it, were laid down as the general principle, including all particular definitions, which was ever and anon adopted by the theologians of that age ....Thus a view was formed of the atonement, which we may term the mystical, inasmuch as it is founded on a general comprehensive view of the subject, rather than on philosophical definitions.*

(8) Thus *Gregory* of Nazianzum Orat. xxxiii. p. 536, numbered speculations on the death of Christ among those things, on which it is useful to have correct ideas, but not dangerous to be mistaken, and placed them on the same level with questions concerning the creation of the world, the nature of matter and of the soul, the resurrection, general judgment, etc. Comp. *Baur*,

p. 109.—*Eusebius* of Cæsarea (demonstr. evang. iv. 12,) merely enumerates various reasons for the death of Christ, without bringing them into connection. Christ died, 1. In order to prove, that he is Lord both over the quick and the dead; 2 To redeem from sin; 3. To atone for sin; 4. To destroy the power of Satan; 5. To give his disciples a visible evidence of the reality of the life to come (by his resurrection); and, 6. To abrogate the sacrifices of the Old Test. dispensation.

The more anxious theologians were to adduce the reasons which induced Christ to lay down his life, the more natural was it, to ask whether God could have accomplished the work of redemption in any other way? *Augustine* rejects such idle questions in the manner of Irenæus, de agone Christi, c 10: Sunt autem stulti, qui dicunt: Non poterat aliter sapientia Dei homines liberare, nisi susciperet hominem, et nasceretur ex femina, et a peccatoribus omnia pateretur. Quibus dicimus: *poterat* omnino, *sed si aliter faceret, similiter vestræ stultitiæ displiceret.* [*Aug.* de trin. xiii. 10. *Greg. Naz.* Orat. ix. p. 157. *Greg. Nyssa*, Orat. cat. c. *Basil the Great* (hom. in Ps. xlviii. § 3.) and *Greg. the Great* (Moral. Lib. xvii. 46.) maintained that the death of the Godman was *necessary* to accomplish the salvation of mankind.] Further particulars may be found in *Münscher*, Handbuch. iv. p. 292, ss. *Baur*, p. 85. *Rufinus* gives a mystical interpretation of the various separate sufferings of Christ, expos. symb. ap. p. 22, ss.

Concerning *the extent of the atonement*, it may be observed, that *Didymus of Alexandria* (on 1 Peter, iii. 22, in *Gallandii* Bibl. PP. T. iv. p. 325: Pacificavit enim Jesus per sanguinem crucis suæ quæ in cœlis et quæ in terra sunt, omne bellum destruens et tumultum), and *Gregory of Nyssa* in some sense (Orat. catech. c. 25, where he speaks of πᾶσα κτίσις) revived the idea of Origen, that the effects of Christ's death were not limited to this world, but extended over the whole universe; Gregory also asserted, that the work of redemption would not have been necessary, if all men had been as holy as Moses, Paul, Ezekiel, Elijah, and Isaiah, (contra Apollin. iii. p. 263.) The opposite view was taken by *Augustine* who, in accordance with his theory, thought that all men stood in need of redemption, but limited the extent of the atonement; comp. the former sections on the doctrine of original sin, and on predestination, and contra Julian vi. c. 24. *Leo the Great*, on the contrary, enlarged the extent of the atonement, Ep. 134, c. 14: Effusio sanguinis Christi pro injustis tam fuit dives ad pretium, ut si universitas captivorum in redemptorem suum crederet, nullum diaboli vincula retinerent.—

A dramatic representation of the *descensus ad inferos* in imitation of the Evang. Nicodemi is given in the discourse: de adventu et annunciatione Joannis (Baptistæ) apud inferos, commonly ascribed to Eusebius of Emisa; comp. also Epiphanius in sepulcr. Christi, Opp. ii. p. 270. *Augusti's* edition of Euseb. of Emisa, p. 1, ss. On the question whether the system of Apollinaris caused the introduction of the said doctrine into the

Apostles' Creed? as well as concerning the relation in which they stood to each other, see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 923.

Lastly, the appropriation of the merits of Christ on the part of the individual Christian is connected with what has been said before, and with the anthropological definitions (§ 107—114.) Comp. *Münscher*, Handbuch, iv. p. 295, 319.

4. *The Church and Her Means of Grace.*

§ 135.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH.

Two causes contributed to determine the doctrine of the *church:* 1. The external history of the church itself, its victory over paganism, and its rising power under the protection of the state. 2. The victory of Augustinism over the doctrines of the *Pelagians,*(1) *Manichæans,*(2) and *Donatists,*(3) which in different ways threatened to destroy ecclesiastical unity. The last mentioned resembled the followers of Novatian in the preceding period, by maintaining that the church was composed only of saints. In opposition to them *Optatus of Mileve,*(4) as well as *Augustine,*(5) asserted that the church consists of the sum total of all who are baptized, and, spiritualizing that which existed in reality, they advanced the idea of a universal Christian church. The bishops of Rome applied this idea to the papal system,(6) and thus prepared the way for the hierarchy of the middle ages. But however different the opinions of the men of those times were respecting the place and nature of the true church, the proposition laid down by former theologians: that *there is no salvation out of the church,* was firmly adhered to, and carried out in all its consequences.(7)

(1) The Pelagians were in so far opposed to the church, as they considered only the *individual* Christian as such, and overlooked the mysterious connection between the individual and the totality. Their strict notions of morality led necessarily to Puritanism; hence the synod of Diospolis (A. D. 415) blamed

them for having said: ecclesiam hic esse sine macula et ruga, Aug. de gestis Pelagii, c. 12. Before this time some Christians in Sicily who, generally speaking, agreed with the Pelagians, had asserted: Ecclesiam hanc esse, quæ nunc frequentatur populis et sine peccato esse posse, August. Ep. clvi.

(2) The Manichæans, by separating the Electi from the rest (Auditores), gave countenance to the principle of an ecclesiola in ecclesia; besides the great body of the Manichæan church itself formed, as the one elect world of light, a contrast with the vast mass of darkness. "*The Manichæan church is in relation to the world what the limited circle of the Electi is in relation to the larger assembly of the Auditores; that which is yet variously divided and separated in the latter, has its central-point of union in the former.*" *Baur*, Manich. Religionssystem p. 282.

(3) On the external history of the Donatists comp. the works on ecclesiastical history. Sources: *Optatus Milevitanus* (about the year 368) de schismate Donatistarum, together with Monumenta vett. ad Donatist. hist. pertinentia ed. *L. E. du Pin*, Par. 1700, ss. (Opp. Aug. T. ix.) *Valesius*, de schism. Donat. in an Appendix to Eusebius. *Norisius* (edited by *Ballerini* brothers) Ven. 1729, iv. fol. *Walch* Ketzergeschichte, vol. iv. Concerning the derivation of the name (whether from Donatus a casis nigris, or from Donat. M.?) see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 1, p. 407. The question at issue, viz. whether Cæcilian could be invested with the episcopal office, having been ordained by a Traditor, and the election of another bishop in the person of Majorinus, led to further dogmatic discussions on the purity of the church. In the opinion of the Donatists, the church ought to be *pure* (sine macula et ruga.) It must, therefore, exercise no forbearance towards any unworthy members (1 Cor. v. and especially many passages from the Old Test.) When the opponents of the Donatists appealed to the parable of the tares and the wheat (Matth. xiii.) the latter applied it (according to our Saviour's own interpretation) to the *world*, and not to the *church*. *Augustine*, however, asserted, mundum ipsum appellatum esse pro ecclesiæ nomine.

(4) Concerning the opinions of *Optatus* (which are stated in the second book of his treatise: de schismate Donatistarum) see *Rothe*, Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche, p. 677, ss. He developed the views of Cyprian. There is but *one* church. It

has five ornamenta or dotes: 1. Cathedra (the unity of episcopacy in the Cathedra Petri); 2. Angelus (the bishop himself); 3. Spiritus Sanctus; 4. Fons (baptism); 5. Sigillum, *i. e.* Symbolum catholicum (according to Sol. Song, iv. 12.) These dotes are distinguished from the sancta membra ac viscera of the church, which appear to him of greater importance than the dotes themselves. They consist in sacramentis et nominibus Trinitatis.

(5) *Augustine* composed a separate treatise, entitled: de unitate ecclesiæ, on this subject.—Comp. contra Ep. Parmeniani and de baptismo. He proceeded, no less than the Donatists, on the principle of the purity of the church, and advocated a rigorous exercise of ecclesiastical discipline; but this should not lead to the depopulation of the church. Some elements enter into the composition of the house of God which do not form the structure of the house itself; some members of the body may be diseased, without its being thought necessary to cut them off at once, though the disease itself belongs no more to the body than the chaff which is mixed up with wheat forms a part of it. Augustine makes a distinction between the corpus Domini verum and the corpus D. permixtum seu simulatum (de doctr. christ. iii. 32,) which stands in connection with his negative view concerning the nature of evil. The grammarian *Tichonius* adopted an intermediate course, see *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 445. The necessity of being externally connected with the church is set forth by Augustine in the same manner as by Tertullian and Cyprian, de unit. eccles. c. 49: Habere caput Christum nemo poterit, nisi qui in ejus corpore fuerit, quod est ecclesia, Ep. c. xli. § 5: Quisquis ab hac catholica ecclesia fuerit separatus, quantumlibet laudabiliter se vivere existimet hoc solo scelere quod a Christi unitate disjunctus est, non habebit vitam, sed Dei ira manebit super eum.

(6) *Leo M.* Sermo i. in natale Apostolorum Petri et Pauli: Ut inenarrabilis gratiæ per totum mundum diffunderetur effectus, Romanum regnum divina providentia præparavit, etc. Comp. Sermo ii.: Transivit quidem in Apostolos alios vis illius potestatis, sed non frustra uni commendatur, quod omnibus intimetur. Petro enim singulariter hoc creditur, quia cunctis ecclesiæ rectoribus proponitur. Manet ergo Petri privilegium, ubicunque ex ipsius fertur æquitate judicium; nec nimia est vel severitas vel remissio, ubi nihil erit legatum, nihil solutum, nisi quod

Petrus aut ligaverit, aut solverit. Comp. *Perthel*, l. c. p. 237, note 4, and the passages quoted by him.

(7) Comp. § 71. *Lactantius* makes the same assertion, though he does not in all respects agree with the catholic church: Instit. div. iii. 30.—iv. 14. ab. init.: Hæc est domus fidelis, hoc immortale templum, in quo si quis non sacrificaverit, immortalitatis præmium non habebit. *Rufinus*, however, does not yet advocate fides *in* Ecclesiam, and thus most clearly distinguishes faith in the church from faith in God and Christ, Expos. fid. 26, 27. Heretics were thought beyond the pale of the *church*, but not beyond that of *Christianity*. *Augustine* calls them quoquomodo Christiani. Aug. de civ. Dei 18, c. 51. Comp. *Marheinecke* (in Daub's Studien, l. c.) p. 186.

§ 136.

THE SACRAMENTS.

The *holy sacraments*, the idea of which was more precisely defined and circumscribed in this period, were regarded as the instruments by means of which the church exerts an influence upon the individual Christian, and transmits the fulness of Divine life, which dwells within it, to the members. *Augustine* saw in them the mysterious union of the (transcendent) Word with the external (visible) element,(1) but expressed no definite opinion respecting the number of sacraments.(2) *Pseudo-Dionysius* (who lived in the fifth century) spoke of six ecclesiastical mysteries;(3) but even during the present period the greatest importance was still attached to baptism and the Lord's Supper.(4)

---

(1) *Aug*. Serm. 272. Opp. T. v. 770: Dicuntur *Sacramenta*, quia in eis aliud videtur, aliud intelligitur. Quod videtur speciem habet corporalem: quod intelligitur fructum habet spiritalem; this gave rise to the definition of the Augustinian school (in Ev. Joh. Tract. 31. c. 15, and de cataclysmo): *Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum.*

(2) Augustine reckoned not only matrimony ("sacramentum nuptiarum") holy orders, ("sacramentum dandi baptismum"), but

occasionally also other ceremonies among the sacraments (the word taken in a more comprehensive sense), since he understood by sacramentum, omne mysticum sacrumque signum. Thus he applies (de peccat. orig. c. 40,) the term sacrament to exorcism, the casting out, and the renunciation of the devil at baptism, and even the rites of the Old Testament: circumcisio carnis, sabbatum temporale, neomeniæ, sacrificia atque omnes hujusmodi innumeræ observationes, Expos. epist. ad Galat. c. iii. 19. (Opp. iii. P. ii. p. 692.) Comp. *Wiggers*, Augustin und Pel. vol. i. p. 9, note. That he so constantly adopted the number four may perhaps be explained from the general preference which he gave to Aristotelianism (c. ep. Parm. ii. c. 13.) *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 1382, 83. Leo the Great also employed the term sacramentum in reference to the most heterogeneous things, comp. *Perthel*, p. 219, note, and Gregory the Great used it sometimes in a more comprehensive, sometimes in a more limited sense, comp. *Lau*, p. 480.

(3) De hier. eccles. c. 2—7. 1. *Baptism*, (μ. φωτίσματος), 2. *The Lord's Supper*, (μ. συνάξεως, εἴτ' οὖν κοινωνίας), 3. *Unction* (*confirmation?* μ. τελετῆς μύρου), 4. *Holy Orders*, (μ. τῶν ἱερατικῶν τελειώσεων), 5. *Monachism* (μ. μοναχικῆς τελειώσεως) which afterwards ceased to be reckoned among the sacraments, 6. *The rites performed on the dead* (μ. ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶς κεκοιμημένων) (they were not the same with the unctio extrema, as the unction in question was not applied to dying persons, but to the corpse; yet there was some analogy between the one and the other.) Matrimony, on the other hand, which Augustine mentioned, was wanting in this list.

(4) This was done, *e. g.* by *Augustine*, Sermo 218, 14: Quod latus, lancea percussum, in terram sanguinem et aquam manavit, procul dubio sacramenta sunt, quibus formatur ecclesia (de Symb. ad catech. c. 6.), and by *Chrysostom* in Joh. hom. 85. (Opp. T. viii. p. 545,) who adopted the same interpretation. On the relation in which the sacraments of the New Testament were supposed to stand to those of the Old, see Augustine de vera rel. c. 17.

§ 137.

BAPTISM.

The notions formed in the preceding period concerning the high importance and efficacy of baptism were more fully developed in the present, especially by *Basil the Great*, *Gregory of Nazianzum*, and *Gregory of Nyssa*,(1) and defined with more dogmatic precision by *Augustine*.(2) Neither the baptism of blood, nor that of tears lost its significance.(3) The theologians of the Greek church zealously defended infant-baptism,(4) while Augustine brought it into more intimate connection with the doctrine of original sin (in opposition to the Pelagians), and adduced it as an additional proof of the said doctrine.(5) Salvation was denied to unbaptized children.(6) Concerning the baptism of heretics, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzum, followed the views of Cyprian on this point, though Gregory did not make the validity of baptism depend on the dignity of the person that performs the ceremony of baptism.(7) But by the exertions of Augustine, the mode adopted by the Romish church became with certain modifications the prevalent one.(8) The Donatists continued to insist upon the necessity of re-baptizing heretics.(9) The baptism of the Manichæans consisted in a kind of lustration altogether different from the baptism of the Catholic church.(10) Among the strict Arians the Eunomians were distinguished from the orthodox church by baptizing not in the name of the Trinity, but in that of the death of Christ.(11)

(1) All of them composed separate discourses on baptism. *Basil, M.*, de Baptismo Opp. T. ii. p. 117. *Greg. Naz.* Or. 40. *Greg. Nyss.* de bapt. Christi Opp. T. iii. p. 371. Gregory of Nazianzum gave a number of different names to Christian baptism, which he carefully distinguished from the baptisms of Moses and John : τὸ φώτισμα λαμπρότης ἐστὶ ψυχῶν, βίου μετάθεσις, ἐπερώτημα τῆς εἰς θεὸν συνειδήσεως (1 Pet. iii. 21), τὸ φώτισμα βοήθεια τῆς ἀσθενείας τῆς ἡμετέρας· τὸ φώτισμα σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις, πνεύματος ἀκολούθησις, λόγου κοινωνία, πλάσματος ἐπανόρθωσις, κατακλυσμὸς ἁμαρτίας, φωτὸς μετουσία, σκότων κατάλυσις· τὸ φώτισμα ὄχημα πρὸς θεὸν, συνεκδημία Χριστοῦ, ἔρεισμα πίστεως, νοῦ τελείωσις, κλεῖς οὐρανῶν βασιλείας, ζωῆς ἄμειψις, δουλείας ἀναίρεσις, δεσμῶν ἔκλυσις, συνθέσεως μεταποίησις· τὸ φώτισμα, τί δεῖ πλείω κα-

ταριθμεῖν; τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ δώρων τὸ κάλλιστον καὶ μεγαλοπρεπέστατον, ὥστερ ἅγια ἁγίων καλεῖταί τινα . . . . οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸ παντὸς ἄλλων τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν φωτισμῶν ὂν ἁγιώτερον· καλεῖται δὲ ὥστερ Χριστὸς, ὁ τούτου δοτὴρ, πολλοῖς καὶ διαφόροις ὀνόμασιν, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ δώρημα, κ. τ. λ. He also repeated the appellations formerly used, such as λοῦτρον, σφραγὶς, etc. "*The following is the principal thought, on which this abundance of names is founded: all the blessings of Christianity appear concentrated in one point in baptism, and are dispensed, as it were, all together in one moment; but all these names can only in so far be applied to baptism, as the person to be baptized possesses the right disposition, without which none can enter into the kingdom of heaven.*" Ullmann, p. 461, where the other passages bearing on this subject are given. In order to prove the necessity of baptism, Gregory further speaks of a *three-fold birth* of man (Or. 40, 2, ab init.), viz. natural birth (τὴν ἐκ σωμάτων,) that through baptism, and that through the resurrection. The first of these is brought about in the night, is slavish and connected with lusts (νυκτερή τέ ἐστι καὶ δούλη καὶ ἐμπαθής), the second is as clear as day-light and free, delivers from lusts, and elevates to a higher, spiritual life (ἡ δὲ ἡμερινὴ καὶ ἐλευθέρα καὶ λυτικὴ παθῶν, πᾶν τὸ αὐτὸ γενέσεως κάλυμμα περιτέμνουσα, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἄνω ζωὴν ἐπανάγουσα.) On *Basil the Great* comp. *Klose*, p. 67, ss.; on *Gregory of Nyssa* see *Rupp*, p. 232, ss., comp. also *Cyrill* Hier. Cat. xvii. c. 37; he ascribed to baptism not only the virtue of taking away sin (from the negative point of view), but also that of elevating the powers of man to a miraculous height; Cat. iii. 3, xix. xx. *Cyr. Alex.* Comm. in Joh. Opp. T. iv. p. 147. [*Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 462, 63.]

(2) *Aug.* Ep. 98, 2: Aqua exhibens forinsecus *sacramentum gratiæ* et spiritus operans intrinsecus *beneficium gratiæ* solvens vinculum culpæ, reconcilians bonum naturæ, regenerant hominem in uno Christo, ex uno Adam generatum. Concupiscentia remains even in those who are baptized, though their guilt is pardoned, de nupt. et concup. i. 28, (c. 25,) [Enchir. ad Laur. 43, and 64.]—He who is not baptized cannot obtain salvation. As for the thief who was admitted by Christ into paradise without baptism, Augustine supposed that he was baptized with blood, instead of water; or he might have been baptized with the water which flowed from the side of Jesus (!), unless it were assumed that he had received baptism at some former time; de anima et ejus origine i. 11, (c. 9.) ii. 14, (c. 10.) 16, c. 12. According to *Leo the Great*,

the baptismal water which is filled with the Holy Ghost, is in relation to the regenerate man, what the womb of the Virgin filled with the same Spirit was in relation to the sinless Redeemer, to whom she gave birth, Sermo 24. 3; 25. 5, (in *Griesbach*, p. 153.)

(3) Thus *Gregory* of Nazianzum adds a fourth baptism to the three already mentioned (viz. the baptisms of Moses, John, and Christ), that of martyrdom and of blood with which Christ himself was baptized; this baptism surpasses the others, in proportion as it is free from sin. Yea (he adds) I know even a *fifth*, viz. that of tears (τὸ τῶν δακρύων), but it is still more difficult, because it is necessary to wet one's couch every night with tears, Orat. xxxix. 17, p. 688. But......" how many tears have we to shed, before they equal the flood of the baptismal bath?" Orat. lx. 9, p. 696. *Ullmann*, p. 459. 465. 480.

(4) *Gregory of Nazianzum* (Orat. lx.) opposed the delay of baptism, which was founded partly on deference paid to the sacrament, partly on incorrect views and immoral tendencies, partly on absurd prejudices.[a] Comp. *Ullmann*, p. 466, ss. Concerning the baptism of infants, he declared (*Ulm.* p. 713.) " that it was better that they should be sanctified without their own consciousness, than that they should depart being neither sealed, nor consecrated," (ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα.) In support of his view he appealed to the rite of circumcision which was performed on the eighth day (comp. the opinion of Fidus § 72, note 6,) the striking of the blood on the door-posts, etc. Gregory, nevertheless, thought that healthy children might wait till the third year, or somewhere there about, because they would be able then to hear and to utter something of the words (μυστικόν τι) used at the performance of the rite, though they might not perfectly understand them, but get rather a general impression of them. His judgment, however, was mild concerning those children who die before baptism, because he well distinguished between intentional and unintentional delay. Yet he did not think that they would obtain perfect salvation. Comp. *Ullmann*, l. c.

---

[a] Comp. *e. g.* the Confession of Augsburg, i. c. 11. *Gregory of Nyssa* also opposed the delay in a separate discourse πρὸς τοὺς βραδύνοντας εἰς τὸ βάπτισμα. Opp. T. ii. p. 215. *Chrysostom* uses similar language. Comp. *Neander*, Chrysostomus, i. p. 6. and 74–77. *A. F. Büsching*, de procrastinatione baptismi apud veteres ejusque causis. Halæ 1747. 4.

(5) That *Gregory* did not, like Augustine, suppose an intimate connection between baptism and original sin, is evident from his assertion (Orat. 40, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 476,) that sins committed by children from ignorance, could not be imputed to them on account of their tender age. Comp. what *Chrysostom* said on this subject according to the quotation of Julian given by *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 3. p. 138: Hac de causa etiam infantes baptizamus, cum non sint coinquinati peccato, ut eis addatur sanctitas, justitia, adoptio, hæreditas, fraternitas Christi, ut ejus membra sint; the opinions of *Theodore* of Mopsuestia are also stated there.[a] *Augustine* did not combat the Pelagians because they rejected baptism, but because they did not draw the same inferences from the rite in question, which he drew from it. The Pelagians admitted that the design of baptism was the remissio peccatorum, but they understood by it the remission of future sins. *Julian* went so far as to anathematize those who did not acknowledge the necessity of infant-baptism, Opus imp. contra Jul. iii. 149. "*Though the Pelagians might have been easily induced by their principles to ascribe a merely symbolical significance to baptism, as an external rite, yet in this, as well as in many other respects, they could not develope their system entirely independent of the ecclesiastical tradition of their age; they endeavoured therefore to reconcile it in the best possible manner with their principles, which owed their origin to quite different causes.*" *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 1389.

(6) Concerning infants that die without being baptized, *Pelagius* expressed himself in cautious terms (quo non eant, scio, quo eant, nescio.) *Ambrose* de Abrah. ii. 11, had previously taught: Nemo adscendit in regnum cœlorum, nisi per sacramentum baptismatis......*Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei.* Utique nullum excipit, non infantem, non aliqua præventum necessitate. Habeant tamen illam opertam pœnarum immunitatem, nescio an habeant regni honorem. Comp. *Wiggers*, i. p. 422. *Augustine's* views on this point were at first milder, de libero arb.

---

[a] *Neander* traces the difference of opinion existing between the eastern and the western church with regard to baptism to their different mode of viewing the doctrine of redemption; the former regarded rather the positive, the latter the negative aspect.

iii. c. 23, but afterwards he was compelled by the consequences of his own system to use harsher expressions. His line of argument is as follows: Every man is born in sin, and stands therefore in need of pardon. He obtains it by baptism; it cleanses children from *original sin*, and those who are baptized in later years, not only from original sin, but also from actual transgressions. (Enchir. ad Laurent. 43.) Since baptism is the only and necessary condition of salvation (comp. note 2,) it follows that unbaptized children are condemned (this fully accorded with his views on predestination.) He was nevertheless disposed to look upon this condemnation as mitissima and tolerabilior (Ep. 186. 27. [c. 8.] de pecc. mer. i. 28. [c. 20,]) though he opposed the doctrine condemned by the synod of Carthage, (A. D. 419,) of an intermediate state, in which unbaptized infants were said to be. Comp. Sermo 294: Hoc novum in ecclesia, prius inauditum est, esse salutem æternam præter regnum cœlorum, esse salutem æternam præter regnum Dei. With regard to *baptized* children, Augustine, as well as the catholic church in general, supposed (the former in accordance with his idealistic doctrine of the church) that the church represents (by means of the godfathers and godmothers) the faith of the children. "*His view seems to have been somewhat as follows: As the child is nourished by the natural powers of his mother after the flesh, before his bodily, independent existence is fully developed, so is he nourished by the higher powers of his spiritual mother, the church, before he has attained unto independent spiritual developement and self-consciousness. This idea would be true to a certain extent, if the visible church corresponded to its ideal.*" *Neander*, Kirchengesch. p. 1394.

(7) *Basil* Ep. can. 1, declared the baptism of heretics void at least when its mode differed from that of the catholic church, or when a different meaning was attached to it; thus he rejected the baptism of the Montanists, because they understood Montanus to be the paraclete. But he was disposed to admit dissenters without baptism, and as a general rule advised to comply with the custom of each separate church.—*Gregory of Nazianzum* rejected the baptism of *notorious* heretics (*τῶν προδήλως κατεγνωσμένων*.) Generally speaking he did not make the efficacy of baptism depend on the external merit of the church or the inherent moral desert (*ἀξιοπιστια*) of the person to be baptized.—He illustrated this by the case of two rings, the one

made of gold, the other of brass, both of which bear the same stamp, Orat. 40, in *Ullmann*, p. 473—75.

(8) De baptismo contra Donatistas lib. vii. (in Opp. Ben. Tom. ix.) It is interesting to see how Augustine seeks to justify Cyprian, from whom he differs; the passages are given in *Munscher* edit. by von Cölln, p. 477.—The limitation spoken of was, that the rite of baptism, if performed out of the catholic church, might be considered valid, but that so far from proving a blessing to the baptized, it would increase their guilt, if they did not afterwards join the catholic church. Thus "*the exclusiveness of the catholic church, which seemed to be objected to on the one hand, was carried to an extreme length on the other.*" *Rothe*, Anfänge der christlichen Kirche, p. 685.—The ceremony of laying up of hands was also performed on the converts. *Leo the Great* insisted upon this point, Ep. 159, 7. 166, 2. 167, 18. (*Griesbach*, p. 155.)

(9) They were condemned by the Conc. Arel. 314. can. 8. *Opt. Mil.* de schism. Donat. v. c. 3....Quid vobis (Donatistis) visum est, non post nos, sed post Trinitatem baptisma geminare? Cujus de sacramento non leve certamen innatum est, et dubitatur an post Trinitatem in eadem Trinitate hoc iterum liceat facere. Vos dicitis: licet; nos dicimus: non licet. Inter licet vestrum et non licet nostrum natant et remigant animæ populorum.

(10) Concerning the baptism of the Manichæans, on which we have but "*scanty information,*" comp. *Baur*, manich. Religionssystem, p. 273.

(11) *Socrat.* v. 24, blamed the Eunomians, because...........*τὸ βάπτισμα παϱεχάϱαξαν· οὐ γὰϱ εἰς τϱιάδα, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν τοῦ Χϱιστοῦ βαπτίζουσι ϑάνατον.* They probably avoided the use of the common formula, which Eunomius elsewhere adduces as a proof that the Spirit is the third person, in order to prevent the unlearned from forming any incorrect views concerning the Trinity. Comp. *Klose*, Eunomius, p. 32. *Rudelbach*, über die Sacramentsworte, p. 25. According to Sozom. vi. 26, the Eunomians are said to have rebaptized all who joined their party.

§ 138.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Marheinecke (comp. § 73.) p. 32—65. *K. Meyer*, p. 18—38.

The mysterious connection supposed to exist between the two natures of Christ, corresponded to the idea of a mystical connection subsisting between the body of Christ and the bread used in the Lord's Supper on the one hand, and between his blood and the wine on the other.(1) This idea, which had taken its rise in the preceding period, was now farther carried out by means of the more fully developed terminology of the church, and by the introduction of liturgical formulæ, which substituted mystical ceremonies for the simple apostolical rite.(2) The doctrine of the *consubstantiality* of Christ's body and blood with the visible elements, was generally held during this period both by the Greek (*Cyrill* and *Chrysostom*,) and Latin churches, (*Hilary* and *Ambrose*,) though some writers spoke of a *real change* from the one into the other.(3) *Theodoret* brought most prominently forward the symbolical import of this ordinance—a view which some other Fathers adopted along with the realistic mode of interpretation,(4) while *Augustine* sought to unite its more profound mystical significance with the symbolical.(5) He also offered a firm opposition(6) to the superstitious reverence which many writers of the present age seemed disposed to pay to the sacrament in question.(7) *Gelasius*, bishop of Rome, spoke very decidedly against the idea of a real change.(8) The notion of a daily repeated sacrifice is distinctly set forth in the writings of *Gregory the Great*.(9)

(1) The controversy respecting the natures of Christ may be said to be repeated in the different views on the Lord's Supper,

but the human nature in the former is represented by the visible element (the bread) in the latter, and the Divine nature in the former by the body of Christ in the latter, which, properly speaking, formed a part of his humanity.—The doctrine of transubstantiation properly speaking, (as it was afterwards held by the Romish church), is essentially *Docetic,* inasmuch as the elements are nothing but a mere deception of the senses. That view of the ordinance in question which considers it as a purely external and symbolical rite (the notion of the Socinians in later times), savours of Ebionitism. The speculative distinction between the sign and the thing which it is meant to teach (the view taken by the Reformed church), is allied to *Nestorianism* (especially the mode in which it was represented by Zuinglius). The doctrine of consubstantiation which prevailed in the present period, and was afterwards in substance adopted by Luther, would remind us of the orthodox doctrine as propounded in the canons of the synod of Chalcedon, if it might not with more propriety be compared with *Eutychianism* and *Monophysitism,* which were in their time but the extremes of orthodox christology. In the said controversy, as well as in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, attempts at harmonizing the various modes of interpretation might easily lead to heretical notions (thus the Calvinistic view.)

(2) On such names as λατρεία ἀναίμακτος, θυσία τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ (*Cyrill* Myst. V.), ἱερουργία, μετάληψις τῶν ἁγιασμάτων, ἁγία τράπεζα, ἐφόδιον (in reference to the administration of the Lord's Supper to the sick), as well as on the formulæ commonly used in connection with the rite of consecration, comp. *Suicer,* Thesaurus sub vocib.; *Touttée* in Diss. ad Cyr. Hier. 3, p. ccxxxiii. ss. *Marheinecke,* l. c. p. 33, ss. *Augusti,* Archæologie, vol. viii. p. 32, ss.

(3) *Cyrill of Jerusalem* so connected (Cat. xxii. § 6.) the miracle performed at the marriage at Cana with the μεταβολή of the elements used in the Lord's Supper, that it is difficult not to suppose that he believed in a *real* and total change, the more so as he added: Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἡ αἴσθησίς σοι τοῦτο ὑποβάλλει, ἀλλὰ ἡ πίστις σε βεβαιούτω· μὴ ἀπὸ τῆς γεύσεως κρίνῃς τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ᾽ ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως πληροφοροῦ ἀνενδοιάστως, σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ καταξιωθείς; and yet he said § 3: ἐν τύπῳ ἄρτου δίδοταί σοι τὸ αἷμα, etc. But as he spoke (Cat. xxi. 3.) of a similar change effected in the oil which was used at the performance of the rite of consecration, with-

out intimating his belief in a real metaphysical change of the substance of the oil into the substance of the Holy Spirit, we may suppose, that his highly rhetorical language meant to teach nothing, but that the inferior is changed into the superior. Comp. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. p. 1396. But Cyrill undoubtedly supposed a real union of the communicants with Christ (σύσσωμοι καὶ σύναιμοι Χριστοῦ χριστοφόροι γινόμεθα), and thought that we participate in the nature of Christ by the assimilation of his body and blood to our members, etc. Cat. xxiii.—*Gregory of Nyssa* draws a parallel between the physical preservation of man by physical food, and his spiritual subsistence by the participation of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. It is the most effectual antidote of the consequence of sin, viz. mortality. The passages bearing on this point (from Cat. 37.) are given by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 499, 500. *Rupp* p. 238, ss. Gregory used the terms μεταποιεῖσθαι, μετατίθεσθαι, μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι τῆς φύσεως τῶν φαινομένων in a sense similar to that of Cyrill. comp. *Rupp*, p. 240, note, and *Neander*, l. c. p. 1397. 98. —*Chrysostom* regards the institution of the Lord's Supper as a proof of the highest love of the Redeemer to mankind, inasmuch as he not only gave them an opportunity of seeing him, but also enabled them to touch him, and to partake of his body, hom. 45, in Joh. (Opp. T. viii. p. 292.) He too teaches a *real* union of the communicants with Christ: 'Αναφύρει ἑαυτὸν ἡμῖν, καί οὐ τῇ πίστει μόνον, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ τῷ πράγματι σῶμα ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦ κατασκευάζει, Hom. 83, in Matth. (Opp. T. vii. p. 869), comp. hom. 24, in Ep. ad Cor. (Opp. T. ix. p. 257,) and other passages quoted by *Marheinecke*, l. c. p. 44. Yet the manner in which Chrysostom speaks of the relation in which the spiritual (νοητόν) stands to the sensuous (αἰσθητόν), and the comparison which he draws between the Lord's Supper and baptism, seem to be opposed to the notion of a real change. "If we were incorporeal, Christ would nourish us with incorporeal things (ἀσώματα); but since the soul is tied to the body, God gives us ἐν αἰσθητοῖς τὰ νοητά." Comp. the passage on Matth. before cited in *Munscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 502. *Ebrard*, p. 284, ss. *Hilary*, de Trin. viii. 13, says in reference to Christ: Naturam carnis suæ ad naturam æternitatis sub sacramento nobis communicandæ carnis admiscuit, that which Irenæus calls ἕνωσις πρὸς ἀφθαρσίαν. *Ambrose*, de initiandis mysteriis, c. 8, and 9.) regards the Lord's Supper as the living bread which came down from heaven (John vi. 51.), and is none other but Christ himself. If blessings pronounced by men (viz. the prophets of the Old Test.), possessed the power of changing the natural elements, how much more must the same be true in reference to the sacrament? Quod si tantum valuit Sermo Eliæ ut ignem de cœlo promeret, non valebit Christi sermo ut species mutet elementorum? All things are created by the Word (Christ): to effect a simple change (mutatio) cannot be too difficult to him, who is the author of creation. The body which was in a miraculous way brought forth by the Virgin, is at the same time the body of the sacrament. Nevertheless, he says, (in contradiction to the assumption of a real change): Ante benedictionem verborum cœlestium species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus Christi *significatur,* and in reference to the wine: ante consecrationem aliud dicitur, post consecrationem *sanguis nuncupatur.* (But it ought not to be forgotten, that critical doubts have been raised respecting the genuineness of this book.) His views are most nearly allied to those of Cyrill, comp. *Ebrard,* p. 306, ss.

(4) The above passages sufficiently show that the symbolical interpretation accompanied the realistic, or rather that they passed over into each other, without the sign and the thing represented by it being always distinctly separated. *Eusebius of Cæsarea,* however, was led by his Origenistic principles to distinguish between the figurative and the real, Demonstr. evangel. i. 10, and Theol. eccles. iii. 12. *Neander,* Kirchengesch. p. 1403. *Athanasius* too attempted a spiritual interpretation of the eating of the body and the drinking of the blood of Christ, ep. iv. ad Serap. (in *Neander,* l. c. p. 1399); and *Gregory of Nazianzum* called the bread and wine symbols and types (ἀντίτυπα)[a] of the great mysteries, Orat. xvii. 12, p. 325. *Ullmann,* p. 484. *Neander,* quotes p. 1397, a fragment of a letter addressed by *Chrysostom* to *Cesarius,* a monk, the authenticity of which he questions. If it were genuine, it would prove that Chrysostom, as well as his disciple *Nilus,* made a clear distinction between the symbol and the thing represented by it. The latter compared, Lib. i. ep. 44. (see *Neander,* l. c.) the bread which has been consecrated, to a document which having been confirmed by the emperor, is called *Sacra.* The distinction made by *Theodoret* between the sign and the thing

---

[a] Comp. *Suicer,* Thes. T. i. p. 383, ss., and *Ullmann,* l. c. who oppose the interpretation of Elias Cretensis.

signified, was intimately connected with the similar distinction which he drew between the human and the Divine natures of Christ, (comp. note 1.) Dial. ii. Opp. iv. p. 126: Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἁγιασμὸν τά μυστικά σύμβολα τῆς οἰκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως. Μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἴδους, καὶ ὁρατά ἐστι καὶ ἁπτὰ, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Νοεῖται δὲ ἅπερ ἐγένετο, καὶ πιστεύεται καὶ προσκυνεῖται, ὡς ἐκεῖνα ὄντα ἅπερ πιστεύεται. Παράθες τοίνυν τῷ ἀρχετύπῳ τὴν εἰκόνα καὶ ὄψει τὴν ὁμοιότητα. Χρὴ γὰρ ἐοικέναι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τὸν τύπον. He also distinguised between the μεταβολὴ τῇ χάριτι and the μεταβολὴ τῆς φύσεως, Dial. i. p. 26.

(5) *Augustine* in interpreting the words pronounced by our Saviour at the institution of this ordinance, reminds us of their figurative import, contra Adimant. c. 12. 3. According to him the language of John vi. is highly figurative, contra advers. leg. et prophetar. ii. c. 9. (The controversy in which he was engaged with the Manichæans led him to defend the figurative style of the Old Test. by adducing similar examples from the New.) He even supposed that the characteristic feature of the sacraments consists in this, that they are symbolical rites, Ep. 98, 9: Si sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. The sacrament in question is the body of Christ secundum quendam modum, but not absolutely, and its participation is a communicatio corporis et sanguinis ipsius (Ep. 54, 1,) comp. de doctr. chr. iii. 10. 16. In the passage last mentioned, he calls the partaking of Christ's body, in the literal sense of the word (John vi. 33,) facinus vel flagitium, and continues as follows: Figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni Dominicæ communicandum et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit, comp. de civ. Dei xxi. c. 25. Respecting the body of Christ he says, ep. 146: Ego Domini corpus ita in cœlo esse credo, ut erit in terra, quando ascendit in cœlum, comp. *Marheinecke*, p. 56, ss. *Neander*, l. c. p. 1400.—On the connection subsisting between the views of Augustine concerning the Lord's Supper, and those respecting baptism, comp. *Wiggers*, ii. p. 146; on the connection subsisting between the former opinions and his views on the sacraments in general, comp. § 137, note 2.

(6) Aug. de trin. iii. 10: possunt habere honorem tamquam religiosa, sed non stuporem tamquam mira.

(7) Thus *Gregory of Nazianzum* himself believed in the supernatural effects of the Lord's Supper, Orat. viii. 17, 18, p. 228, 229, and Ep. 240. *Ullmann,* p. 483, 84.—On the communion of children, which was common in the Latin church, comp. the works on antiquities.

(8) *Gelas.* de duab. natur. in Christo, Bibl. max. PP. T. viii. p. 703, quoted by *Meyer*, p. 34. *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, p. 504: Certe sacramenta, quæ sumimus, corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur participes naturæ *et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini.* Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Satis ergo nobis evidenter ostenditur, hoc nobis in ipso Christo Domino sentiendum, quod in ejus imagine profitemur, celebramus et sumimus, ut sicut in hanc, scilicet in divinam transeant, Sancto Spiritu perficiente, substantiam, *permanente tamen in suæ proprietate natura,* sic illud ipsum mysterium principale, cujus nobis efficientiam virtutemque veraciter repræsentant.

(9) After the example of Cyprian, the idea of a sacrifice is distinctly set forth by most of the Fathers of this period. Thus by *Gregory* of Nazianzum, Orat. ii. 95, p. 56. *Ullmann*, p. 483, and *Basil* the Great, Ep. 93, (though without any more precise definition, *Klose,* p. 72.) But *Gregory the Great* speaks more distinctly, Moral. Lib. xxii. 26, of a *quotidianum immolationis sacrificium,* comp. *Lau,* p. 484, ss.

5. *The Doctrine of the Last Things.*

§ 139.

MILLENNARIANISM.—THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

The contest which *Origen* had fought against the advocates of Millennarianism, was soon after his death decided in his favour. His disciple, *Dionysius of Alexandria,* succeeded more by persuasion, than by force, in imposing silence on the followers of *Nepos,* an Egyptian bishop, who, adhering to the letter of Scripture, were opposed to all allegorical interpretation, and had the presbyter *Coracion* for their leader after the death of

Nepos.(1) Millennarianism was from that time supported by but a few of the eastern theologians.(2) In the West the millennarian notions were advocated by *Lactantius*,(3) but combated by *Augustine*, who had once himself entertained similar views.(4) It was very natural that Christianity should confidently expect a longer existence on earth, after it had become connected with the state, and been permanently established. Thus the period of Christ's second coming, and the destruction of the world, was deferred from time to time, and it was only extraordinary events that caused men for a season to look forward to these events as nigh at hand.—The notion of *Marcellus*, that Christ's *heavenly* kingdom itself will at some future period come to an end (founded on 1 Cor. xv. 25), forms a remarkable parallel to Millennarianism.(5)

---

(1) On the treatise of Nepos (A. D. 355.) entitled: ἔλεγχος τῶν ἀλληγοριστῶν, and that of Dionysius περὶ ἐπαγγελιῶν, as well as on the entire controversy comp. Euseb. vii. 24. Gennad. de dogm. eccles. c. 55. *Mosh.* comment. p. 720–28. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. 3. p. 1109. Coracion retracted his former views in consequence of a disputation brought about by Dionysius.

(2) *Methodius*, who was in part an opponent of Origen, propounded millennarian notions in his treatise: the feast of the ten virgins (a dialogue on chastity), which was composed in imitation of Plato's Symposium. Orat. ix. § 5. (in *Combefisii* Auctuar. noviss. Bibl. PP. Græc. pars. i. p. 109.) *Neander*, Kirchengesch. i. 3. p. 1233. According to Epiph. hær. 72. p. 1013. (comp. Hier. in Jes. Lib. xviii.) *Apollinaris* too held millennarian notions, and wrote a treatise in 2 books against Dionysius, which met with great success at the time: Quem non solum (says Jerome l. c.) suæ sectæ homines, sed nostrorum in hac parte duntaxat plurimum sequitur multitudo. Concerning the millennarian views of *Bar Sudaili*, abbot of Edessa in Mesopotamia towards the close of the fifth century, comp. *Neander* l. c. ii. 3. p. 1181.

(3) Inst. vii. 14—26. c. 14: Sicut Deus sex dies in tantis rebus fabricandis laboravit, ita et religio ejus et veritas in his sex mil-

libus annorum laboret necesse est, malitia prævalente ac dominante. Et rursus, quoniam perfectis operibus requievit die septimo eumque benedixit, necesse est, ut in fine sexti millesimi anni malitia omnis aboleatur e terra et regnet per annos mille justitia, sitque tranquillitas et requies a laboribus, quos mundus jamdiu perfert. In the subsequent part of the chapter he gives a full description of the state of the political, the physical, and the religious world antecedent to the millennial kingdom, and appeals both to the Sibylline oracles and to the work of Hystaspes. Comp. *Corrodi*, ii. p. 410. 423. 441. 455.

(4) Sermo 159. (Opp. T. v. p. 1060.) which may be compared with de civ. Dei xx. 7......Quæ opinio esset utcunque tolerabilis, si aliquæ deliciæ spiritales in illo sabbato adfuturæ sanctis per Domini præsentiam crederentur. *Nam etiam nos hoc opinati fuimus aliquando.* Sed cum eos qui tunc resurrexerint, dicant immoderatissimis carnalibus epulis vacaturos in quibus cibus sit tantus ac potus, ut non solum nullam modestiam teneant, sed modum quoque ipsius incredulitatis excedant: nullo modo ista possunt, nisi a carnalibus credi. Hi autem, qui spiritales sunt, istos ista credentes χιλιαστὰς appellant græco vocabulo, quos verbum e verbo exprimentes, nos possumus Milliarios nuncupare. The passages in the book of Revelation bearing on this subject are expounded in the subsequent chapters.

(5) Comp. the works on Marcellus quoted § 92. 6. *Klose*, p. 42, ss. and the passages cited by him. *Cyrill* of Jerusalem Cat. xv. 27. (14. Milles) combating this opinion, appeals to the words of the angel (Luke i. 33), and of the prophets (Dan. vii. 13, 14, etc.); in reference to 1 Cor. xv. 25, he asserts that the term ἄχϱι includes the terminus ad quem.—*Klose*, p. 82, questions whether Photinus adopted the views of Marcellus.

§ 140.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

The notion of a two-fold resurrection founded on the language of the Book of Revelation, was still held by *Lactantius*,(1) but afterwards shared the fate of Millennarianism.(2) Though *Methodius* had combated Origen's idealistic doctrine of the resurrection,(3) yet several of the eastern theologians adopted it.(4) till the zealous followers of the Anti-Origenist party succeeded in the ensuing controversies in establishing their doctrine, that the body raised from the tomb is in every respect identical with that which formed in this life the organ of the soul. *Jerome* even went so far as to make this assertion in reference to the very hairs and teeth.(5) *Augustine's* views on this point were, during the earlier part of his life, more in accordance with the Platonico-Alexandrian mode of thinking; but afterwards he gave the preference to more sensuous notions, though he was at much pains to clear the doctrine in question as far as possible from all gross and carnal additions.(6) Latter definitions have reference rather to unessential points.(7)

---

(1) Inst. vii. 20: Nec tamen universi tunc (i. e. at the commencement of the millennial reign) a Deo judicabuntur, sed ii tantum, qui sunt in Dei religione versati. Comp. c. 26 :...Eodem tempore (i. e. at the end of the world after the millennial reign) fiet secunda illa et publica omnium resurrectio, in qua excitabuntur injusti ad cruciatus sempiternos.

(2) *Aug.* de civ. Dei xx. 7: De his duabus resurrectionibus Joannes......eo modo locutus est, ut earum prima a quibusdam nostris non intellecta, insuper etiam in quasdam ridiculas fabulas verteretur. Comp. Epiphan. Ancor. § 97, p. 99. Gennad. lib. i. c. 6, et 25.

(3) *Περὶ ἀναστάσεως λόγος.* Phil. Bibl. cod. 234. *Rössler*, i. p. 297. Comp. Epiph. hær. 64, 12—62.

(4) *Gregory* of Nazianzum, *Gregory* of Nyssa, and partly also *Basil* the Great adopted the views of Origen. Thus Gregory of Nazianzum (Orat. ii. 17, p. 20. and in other places) rested belief in immortality principally on this, that man, considered as a spiritual being, possesses a Divine, and consequently an immortal nature. The mortal body is that which perishes, but the soul is the breath of the Almighty, and the deliverance from the fetters of the body is the most essential point of future happiness, see *Ullmann*, p. 501. 2. Similar expressions were used by Gregory of Nyssa de anima et resurrectione, Opp. T. iii. p. 181. (247.) see *Rupp*, p. 187, ss. and *Münscher*, Handbuch. iv. p. 439. Both Gregory of Nazianzum, and Gregory of Nyssa compared

e. g. the body of man to the coats of skins with which our first parents were clothed after the fall. Concerning the more indefinite views of *Basil* (Hom. viii. in Hexaëmeron, p. 78, and in famem p. 72.) see *Klose* p. 77. *Titus of Bostra* (fragm. in Joh. Damasceni parallelis sacris Opp. T. ii. p. 763.) propounded a more refined doctrine of the resurrection. *Chrysostom*, though asserting the identity of the body, hom. x. in 2. Ep. ad Cor. (Opp. T. ix. p. 603), kept to the Pauline doctrine, and maintained in particular the difference between the present and the future body: Σὺ δέ μοι σκόπει, πῶς διὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων δείκνυσι (ὁ Ἀπ.) τὴν ὑπεροχὴν τῶν μελλόντων πρὸς τὰ παρόντα· εἰπὼν γὰρ ἐπίγειον (2 Cor. v. 1.) ἀντέθηκε τὴν οὐρανίαν κ. τ. λ. *Synesius,* a Christian philosopher of Cyrene, frankly acknowledged that he could not adopt the popular notions on this point, (which some interpreted as a complete denial of the doctrine of the resurrection.) Comp. Evagr. hist. eccl. i. 15. and Ep. 105, ad Euoptium fratrem in the note of *Vales.* on that passage.

(5) *Epiphanius, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Jerome* may be considered as the representatives of this zealous party. The last two had themselves formerly entertained more liberal views, nor did Theophilus even afterwards hesitate to ordain *Synesius* to the office of bishop; see *Münscher*, Handbuch. iv. p. 442. But they opposed, with especial vehemence, *John of Jerusalem* and *Rufinus.* Jerome was by no means satisfied (Apol. contra Ruf. lib. 4. Op. T. ii. p. 145), with the language of Rufinus, who asserted the resurrection hujus carnis, and still less with the caution of *John,* who distinguished (rightly in the exegetical point of view) between flesh and body. He therefore makes the following definite assertions (adv. errores Joann. Hier. ad Pammach. Opp. T. ii. p. 118, ss), which he founds especially on Job xix. 26: Caro est proprie, quæ sanguine, venis, ossibus nervisque constringitur......Certe ubi pellis et caro, ubi ossa et nervi et sanguis et venæ, ibi carnis structura, ibi sexus proprietas...... Videbo autem in ista carne, quæ me nunc cruciat, quæ nunc præ dolore distillat. Idcirco Deum in carne conspiciam, quia omnes infirmitates meas sanavit.—And thus he says in reference to the resurrection-bodies: Habent dentes, ventrem, genitalia et tamen nec cibis nec uxoribus indigent. From the stridor dentium of the condemned he infers that we shall have teeth; the passage: Capilli capitis vestri numerati sunt, proves, in his opinion, that not even our hairs will be wanting. But his prin-

cipal argument is founded on the identity of the body of believers with that of Christ. In reference to 1 Cor. xv. 50, he lays great stress upon the use of the term *possidere* regnum Dei, which he distinguishes from the resurrectio. Comp. *Prudentius* (apotheos. 1063, ss. :)

> Nosco meum in Christo corpus resurgere. Quid me
> Desperare jubes? Veniam, quibus ille revenit
> Calcata de morte viis. Quod credimus, hoc est :
> Et totus veniam, nec enim minor aut alius quam
> Nunc sum restituar. Vultus, vigor et color idem,
> Qui modo vivit, erit. *Nec me vel dente vel ungue*
> *Fraudatum* revomet patefacti fossa sepulcri.

(6) *Augustine* propounded the more liberal view : de fide et symb. c. 10 : Tempore immutationis angelicæ non jam caro erit et sanguis, sed tantum corpus—in cœlestibus nullo caro, sed corpora simplicia et lucida, quæ appellat Ap. spiritalia, nonnulli autem vocant ætheria ; the opposite view is set forth in his Retractiones, p. 17. The whole doctrine is fully developed in Enchirid. ad Laur. 84–92, and de civ. Dei xxii. c. 11–21 ; Erit ergo spiritui subdita caro spiritalis, sed tamen caro, non spiritus, sicut carni subditus fuit spiritus ipse carnalis, sed tamen spiritus, non caro. In reference to the general aspect of the doctrine he says, ad Laur. c. 88, ss. : Non perit Deo terrena materies, de qua mortalium creatur caro, sed in quemlibet pulverem cineremve solvatur, in quoslibet halitus aurasque diffugiat, in quamcunque aliorum corporum substantiam vel in ipsa elementa vertatur, in quorumcunque animalium etiam hominum cedat carnemque mutetur, illi animæ humanæ puncto temporis redit, quæ illam primitus, ut homo fieret, cresceret, viveret, animavit ; but this admits of some limitation : Ipsa itaque terrena materies, quæ discedente anima fit cadaver, non ita resurrectione reparabitur, ut ea, quæ dilabuntur et in alias atque alias aliarum rerum species formasque vertuntur (quamvis ad corpus redeant, unde lapsa sunt) ad easdem quoque corporis partes, ubi fuerunt, redire necesse sit, (this would be impossible especially in the case of hairs and nails.) Sed quemadmodum si statua cujuslibet solubilis metalli aut igne liquesceret, aut contereretur in pulverem, aut confunderetur in massam, et eam vellet artifex ex illius materiæ quantitate reparare, nihil interesset ad ejus integritatem, quæ particula materiæ cui membro

statuæ redderetur, dum tamen totum, ex quo constituto fuerat restituta resumeret. Ita Deus mirabiliter atque ineffabiliter artifex de toto, quo caro nostra constiterat, eam mirabili et ineffabili celeritate restituet. Nec aliquid attinebit ad ejus reintegrationem, utrum capilli ad capillos redeant et ungues ad ungues: an quicquid eorum perierat mutetur in carnem et in partes alius corporis revocetur, curante artificis providentia, ne quid indecens fiat. Nor is it necessary to suppose, that the differences of size and stature will continue in the life to come, but every thing will be restored in accordance with the Divine image, cap. 90. Resurgent igitur Sanctorum corpora sine ullo vitio, sine ulla deformitate, sicut sine ulla corruptione, onere, difficultate, etc. All will have the stature of the full-grown man, and, as a general rule, will be thirty years old (the age of Christ), de civ. De lib. i. c. 12. He gives particular rules respecting children, de civ. Dei lib. i. c. 14; the difference of sex, c. 17; concerning children born prematurely and lusus naturæ, ib. c. 13, and ad Laur. 85, 87. Nevertheless he says: Si quis in eo corporis modo, in quo defunctus est, resurrecturum unumquemque contendit, non est cum illo laboriosa contradictione pugnandum, de civ. Dei l. i. c. 16. On the similar views of *Gregory the Great*, see *Lau*, p. 510, ss.

(7) The opinion of Origen having been condemned by the decisions of synods (*Mansi* ix. p. 399 and 516), orthodoxy admitted but of slight modifications. We may mention, *e. g.* the controversy which arose between *Eutychius*, patriarch of Constantinople, who maintained that the resurrection body was impalpabilis, and *Gregory the Great*, bishop of Rome, who denied it (Greg. M. Moral. in Jobum lib. xiv. c. 29. *Münscher*, Handbuch p. 449); and the controversy which took place between the Monophysitic Philoponites and the Cononites respecting the question, whether the resurrection was to be considered as a new creation of matter, or as a mere transformation of the form? Comp. Timoth. de recept. hæret. in *Cotelerii* monum. eccles. græcæ, T. iii. p. 413, ss. *Walch*, Historie der Ketzereien, vol. viii. p. 762, ss. *Münscher*, Handbuch iv. p. 450, 51.

§ 141.

GENERAL JUDGMENT—CONFLAGRATION OF THE WORLD.—PURGATORY.

Höpfner, de origine dogmatis de purgatorio. Hal. 1792.

The notions concerning the general judgment were still substantially founded on the representations of Scripture, but more fully developed and variously adorned by the theologians of the present period.(1) We have already seen that the Fathers of the preceding age believed in a general conflagration which was to accompany the general judgment, as well as to destroy the world, and that they ascribed to it a purifying power.(2) But, according to *Augustine*, this purifying fire (ignis purgatorius) had its seat in Hades, *i. e.* the place in which the souls of the departed were supposed to remain until the general resurrection.(3) This idea, as well as further additions on the part of other theologians, especially *Cesarius of Arles*,(4) and *Gregory the Great*,(5) prepared the way for the doctrine of purgatory. This doctrine being brought afterwards into connection with the notion of the mass, was made subservient to the selfish purposes of the Romish hierarchy, and contributed to obscure the evangelical doctrine of salvation.

(1) The end of the world will be preceded by signs in the sun, the moon, and the stars; the sun will be changed into blood, the moon will not give her light, etc. Comp. *Basil the Great*, Hom. 6. in Hexaëm. p. 54, (al. 63.) *Lact.* vii. 19, ss, c. 25, (he has regard to the Sibylline oracles.) Short descriptions of the general judgment are given by *Greg. of Nazianz.* Orat. xvi. 9, p. 305, ss., and xix. 15, p. 373. According to *Basil*, Moral. Regula. 68, 2, the coming of our Lord will be sudden, the stars will fall from heaven, etc., but we ought not to think of his second manifestation as τοπικὴ ἢ σαρκική, but ἐν δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς κατὰ πάσης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀθρόως, see *Klose*, p. 74. Comp. Hom. in Ps. xxxiii. p. 184, (al. 193, 94.) Ep. 46. According to *Cyrill of*

Jerusalem, the second coming of our Lord will be announced by the appearance of a cross in the air, Cat. xv. 22; comp. the whole description, 19—33.—*Augustine* endeavoured dogmatically to define the facts which are represented in figurative language,[a] instead of giving rhetorical descriptions, as the Greek theologians used to do: he therefore sought to reconcile the doctrine of retribution with his doctrine of predestination; see de civ. Dei xx. 1: Quod ergo in confessione ac professione tenet omnis Ecclesia Dei veri, Christum de cœlo esse venturum ad vivos ac mortuos judicandos, hunc divini judicii ultimum diem dicimus, *i. e.* novissimum tempus. Nam per quot dies hoc judicium tendatur, incertum est: sed scripturarum more sanctarum diem poni solere pro tempore, nemo qui illas litteras quamlibet negligenter legerit, nescit. Ideo autem cum diem judicii dicimus, addimus ultimum vel novissimum, quia et nunc judicat et ab humani gereris initio judicavit, dimittens de paradiso, et a ligno vitæ separans primos homines peccati magni perpetratores; imo etiam quando angelis peccantibus non pepercit, quorum princeps homines a se ipso subversus invidendo subvertit, procul dubio judicavit. Nec sine illius alto justoque judicio et in hoc aërio cœlo et in terris, et dæmonum et hominum miserrima vita est erroribus ærumnisque plenissima. Verum etsi nemo peccasset, non sine bono rectoque judicio universam rationalem creaturam perseverantissime sibi Domino suo hærentem in æterna beatitudine retineret. Judicat etiam non solum universaliter de genere dæmonum atque hominum, ut miseri sint propter primorum meritum peccatorum: sed etiam de singulorum operibus propriis, quæ gerunt arbitrio voluntatis, etc. —Concerning what he says on the transaction of the general judgment itself, see ibid. c. 14.

(2) Comp. § 77, note 6. This idea of a purifying fire is very distinctly set forth by *Gregory* of Nazianzum, Orat. xxxix. 19, p. 690. (*Ullmann* p. 504.) His language is less definite in Orat. xl. 36. p. 730. (*Ullmann* p. 505.) Roman-Catholic commentators have inferred too much in support of their theory from the general expression πυρὶ καθαιρομένη which *Gregory* of Nyssa makes use of in his treatise de iis, qui præmature abripiuntur (Opp. iii. p. 322.); see *Schröckh*, Kirchengeschichte xiv. p. 135.

---

[a] He points out (de gestis Pel. c. 4, § 11.) the variety of figurative expressions used in Scripture in reference to this subject, which can hardly be so united as to give *one* idea.

Basil the Great supposes (Hom. 3. in Hexaëmeron, p. 27), that the fire which is to destroy the world has existed from the beginning of creation, but that its effects are neutralized by a sufficient quantity of water, until the consumption of the latter; see *Klose* p. 73.

(3) *Augustine* agrees with other theologians in his general views concerning the conflagration of the world, de civ. Dei xx. 18; in the same place he endeavours to give a satisfactory reply to the question where the righteous will be during the general conflagration? Possumus respondere, futuros eos esse in superioribus partibus, quo ita non adscendet flamma illius incendii, quemadmodum nec unda diluvii. Talia quippe illis inerunt corpora, ut illic sint, ubi esse voluerint. Sed nec ignem conflagrationis illius pertimescent immortales atque incorruptibiles facti: sicut virorum trium corruptibilia corpora atque mortalia in camino ardenti vivere illæsa potuerunt. Like the earlier theologians Augustine brings the idea of a purification wrought by the fire in question, into connection with 1 Cor. iii. 11—15; see Enchirid. ad Laur. § 68. In the next section he continues as follows (in reference to the disposition manifested by so many to cling too much to earthly goods): Tale aliquid *etiam post hanc vitam fieri* incredibile non est, et utrum ita sit, quæri potest. Et aut inveniri aut latere nonnullos fideles *per ignem purgatorium*, quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari: non tamen tales de quibus dictum est, quod regnum Dei non possidebunt, nisi convenienter pœnitentibus eadem crimina remittantur. Comp. de civ. Dei l. i. c. 24. 26. quæst ad Dulc. § 13. On the question, whether *Pelagius* rejected the doctrine of a purifying fire? comp. the acts of the synod of Diospolis quoted by *Wiggers*, i. p. 195. *Neander*, Kirchensgesch. ii. 3, p. 1199, 1225 and 1404.—Concerning the views of *Prudentius* see *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. vii. p. 126.

(4) Sermo viii. 4. in August. Opp. T. v. Append.; the passage is quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, i. p. 62. He makes a distinction between capitalia crimina and minuta peccata. None but the latter can be expiated either in this life by painful sufferings, alms, or placability manifested towards enemies, or in the life to come by the purifying fire (longo tempore cruciandi.)

(5) *Gregory the Great* may rightly be called the "*inventor of*

the doctrine of purgatory." if we may call it an invention. On the one hand, he lays down (dial. iv. 39.) the doctrine of purgatory as *an article of faith* by saying: De quibusdam levibus culpis esse ante judicium purgatorius ignis *credendus* est, and rests his opinion on Matth. xii. 31. (He thinks that some sins are not pardoned till after death, but to that class belong only what are called minor sins, such as talkativeness, levity, and a dissolute life.)[a] On the other hand, he was the first writer who clearly propounded the idea of a deliverance from purgatory by intercessory prayer, by masses for the dead (sacra oblatio hostiæ salutaris) etc., and adduced instances in support of his view, to which he himself attached credit. Comp. *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xvii. p. 255, ss. *Neander*, Kircheng. iii. p. 271, ss. If we compare Gregory's doctrine with the former (rather idealistic) notions concerning the efficacy of the purifying fire, we may adopt the language of *Schmidt* (Kirchenges. iii. p. 280.): "*The belief in a lasting desire after a higher degree of perfection, which death itself cannot quench,* DEGENERATED INTO A BELIEF IN PURGATORY."

§ 142.

THE STATE OF THE BLESSED AND THE DAMNED.

Gregory of Nazianzum, and some other theologians supposed that the souls of the righteous are at once admitted into the presence of God (without going to Hades and prior to the resurrection of the body), while the majority of the ecclesiastical writers of this period imagined that men do not receive their full reward till after the general judgment and the resurrection of the body.(1) According to *Gregory of Nazianzum, Gregory of Nyssa,* and other theologians who adopted the views of Origen, the blessedness of the redeemed in heaven consists in more fully developed knowledge, in intercourse with all the saints and righteous, and partly in the deliverance from the fetters of the body; *Augustine* added that the soul would obtain its true liberty. But all writers admitted the difficulty of forming just views on this subject.(2) The sufferings of the damned were thought to be the opposite of the pleasures of the blessed, and in the descriptions of the punishments of hell prominence was commonly given to sensuous representations. Many were disposed to regard the fire in question as a material fire; thus *Lactantius* depicted it in very lively colours, and others indulged in still more terrible descriptions.(3) There were yet some theologians who favoured the idea of degrees both in heaven and in hell.(4) Concerning the duration of the punishments of hell the prevailing opinion was, that they are eternal,(5) though some of the advocates of Origenism still hesitated to deprive the damned of every glimpse of hope. *Jerome* at least admitted, that those among the damned who have been *orthodox*, enjoy a kind of privilege.(6) And, lastly, it is a remarkable fact, which however admits of a satisfactory solution, that *Augustine* entertained milder views on this point than *Pelagius*,(7) who, as well as *Chrysostom*,(8) maintained the eternal duration of the punishments of hell, in accordance with his strict doctrine of moral retribution. The doctrine of the restitution of all things shared the fate of Origenism,(9) and made its appearance in after ages only in connection with other heretical notions, and especially with Millennarianism.

---

[a] According to Gregory, the passage before alluded to in 1 Cor. iii. may be referred to the tribulations in hac vita, but he prefers himself the usual interpretation, and understands by the wood, hay, and stubble, mentioned in iii. 12. unimportant and slight *sins!*

---

(1) Orat. x. p. 173, 174. Comp. Gennad. de. dogm. eccles. c. 46. *Greg. M.* Moral. l. iv. c. 37. Others, on the contrary, and the theologians of the western church in particular, adopted the notion of intermediate states, which is allied to that concerning Hades. Thus *Ambrose* says de bono mortis c. 10; de Cain et Abel l. ii. c. 2: Solvitur corpore anima et post finem vitæ hujus adhuc tamen futuri judicii ambiguo suspenditur. Ita finis nullus, ubi finis putatur. *Hilary* Tract. in Ps. cxx. p. 383. *Aug.*

Enchirid. ad Laur. § 109.: Tempus, quod inter hominis mortem et ultimam resurrectionem interpositum est, animas abditis receptaculis contineri, sicut unaquæque digna est vel requie vel ærumna, pro eo quod sortita est in carne cum viveret. Even some of the Greek theologians taught, that no man receives his full reward before the general judgment. *Chrys.* in Ep. ad Hebr. hom. xxviii. (Opp. T. xii. p. 924) et in 1. Ep. ad Corinth. hom. xxxix. (Opp. xi. p. 436.) He there defends the belief in the Christian doctrine of the *resurrection* as distinct from a mere hope in the *continued* existence of the soul after death. *Cyrill of Alex.* contra Anthropom. c. 5. c. 7, ss.

(2) According to *Gregory of Nyssa* orat. catech. c. 40. the blessedness of heaven cannot be described by words. *Gregory of Nazianzum* Orat. xvi. 9, p. 306, supposes it to consist in the perfect knowledge of God, and especially of the Trinity (ϑεωρία τριάδος); such a view is in full accordance with the intellectual, and contemplative tendency predominant in the eastern church at that time. Gregory however does not restrict the enjoyment of eternal happiness to the intuitive vision and knowledge of God; but inasmuch as this knowledge itself is brought about by a *closer union with God*, the blessedness of the redeemed in heaven will also consist in this very inward union with God, in the perfect peace both of the soul and of the heavenly habitations, in the intercourse with blessed spirits, and in the knowledge of all that is good and beautiful, Orat. viii 23, p. 232. Other rhetorical descriptions will be found Orat. vii. 17, p. 209. vii. 21, p. 213. *Ullmann*, p. 502. *Basil the Great* depicts this blessedness for the most part in a negative way; Homil. in Ps. cxiv. p. 204, quoted by *Klose*, p. 76. *Augustine* also says de civ. Dei xxii. 29, 30: Et illa quidem actio, vel potius quies atque otium quale futurum sit, *si verum velim dicere nescio;* non enim hoc unquam per sensus corporis vidi. Si autem mente, i. e. intelligentia vidisse me dicam, quantum est aut quid est nostra intelligentia ad illam excellentiam?—According to Augustine the happiness of the blessed consists in the enjoyment of heavenly peace which passes knowledge, and of the intuitive vision of God, which cannot be compared with bodily vision. But while Gregory of Nazianzum assigned the first place to *theological* knowledge, Augustine founded his theory upon *anthropology.* The blessed obtain true liberty, by which he understood that they *can* no longer sin; nam primum liberum arbitrium,

quod homini datum est, quando primum creatus est rectus, potuit non peccare, sed potuit et peccare; hoc autem novissimum eo potentius erit, quo peccare non poterit. Verum hoc quoque Dei munere, non suæ possibilitate naturæ. Aliud est enim, esse Deum, aliud participem Dei. Deus natura peccare non potest; particeps vero Dei ab illo accipit, ut peccare non possit....Sicut enim prima immortalitas fuit, quam peccando Adam perdidit, posse non mori, novissima erit, non possi mori. Augustine moreover thought, that the blessed retain the full recollection of the past, even of the sufferings which befell them while on earth; but they do not feel what was painful in them. They also know the torments of the damned without being disturbed in their own happiness (similar views were expressed by Chrysostom, hom. x. in 2 Ep. ad Corinth. Opp. T. xi. p. 605.) God is the essential substance of the blessedness in question, no less than the end and object of every desire: Ipse erit finis desideriorum nostrorum, qui sine fine videbitur, sine fastidio amabitur, sine fatigatione laudabitur.—*Cassiodorus* de anima c. 12. Opp. T. ii. p. 604, 605, gives a summary of what earlier theologians had taught concerning the eternal happiness of the blessed.

(3) *Lactant.* vii. 21....Quia peccata in corporibus contraxerunt (damnati), rursus carne induentur, ut in corporibus piaculum solvant; et tamen non erit caro illa, quam Deus homini superjecerit, huic terrenæ similis, sed insolubilis ac permanens in æternum, ut sufficere possit cruciatibus, et igni sempiterno, cujus natura diversa est ab hoc nostro, quo ad vitæ necessaria utimur, qui, nisi alicujus materiæ fomite alatur, extinguitur. At ille divinus per se ipsum semper vivit ac viget sine ullis alimentis, nec admixtum habet fumum, sed est purus ac liquidus et in aquæ modum fluidus. Non enim vi aliqua sursum versus urgetur, sicut noster, quem labes terreni corporis, quo tenetur, et fumus intermixtus exsilire cogit et ad cœlestem naturam cum trepidatione mobili subvolare. Idem igitur divinus ignis una eademque vi atque potentia et cremabit impios et recreabit, et quantum e corporibus absumet, tantum reponet, ac sibi ipsi æternum pabulum subministrabit. Quod poëtæ in vulturem Tityi transtulerunt, ita sine ullo revirescentium corporum detrimento aduret tantum, ac sensu doloris afficiet.—*Gregory of Nazianzum* supposed the punishment of the damned to consist essentially in their separation from God, and the consciousness of

their own vileness (Orat. xvi. 9. p. 306.): *Τοῖς δὲ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων βάσανος, μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων τὸ ἀπεῤῥίφθαι θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἐν τῷ συνειδότι αἰσχύνη πέρας οὐκ ἔχουσα.* *Basil the Great*, on the contrary, gives a more vivid description of that punishment, homil. in Ps. xxiii. Opp. T. i. p. 151, and elsewhere. Comp. *Klose*, p. 75, 76. *Münscher*, Handbuch iv. p. 458. *Chrysostom* eloquently represents the torments of the damned in a variety of horrid pictures, in Theod. lapsum i. c. 6. (Opp. T. iv. p. 560, 561.) Nevertheless in other places, *e. g.* in his ep. ad Rom. hom. xxxi. (Opp. x. p. 396.) he justly observes, that it is of more importance to know how to escape hell, than to know where it is, and what is its nature. *Gregory of Nyssa* (orat. catech. 40.) endeavours to divest the idea of hell of all that is sensuous (the fire of hell is not to be looked upon as a material fire, nor is the worm which never dies an *ἐπίγειον θηρίον*.) *Augustine* too imagines, that separation from God is in the first instance to be regarded as the death and punishment of the damned (de morib. eccles. cath. c. 11.) But he leaves it to his readers to choose between the more sensuous, or the more spiritual mode of perception; it is at all events better to think of both; de civit. Dei xxi. 9, 10, comp. Greg. M. Moral. xv. c. 17.

(4) *Gregory of Nazianzum* rests his idea of different degrees of blessedness on John xiv. 2, comp. Orat. xxvii. 8, p. 493, xiv. 5, p. 260, xix. 7, p. 367, xxxii. 33, p. 601. *Ullmann*, p. 503. *Basil the Great* sets forth similar views in Eun. lib. 3, p. 273. *Klose*, p. 77. *Augustine* too supposed the existence of such degrees, de civ. Dei xxii. 30. 2. He admits that it is impossible to say *in what* they consist, quod tamen futuri sint, non est ambigendum. But in the absence of any feeling of envy whatever, no one's happiness will be the less because he does not enjoy so high a position as others. Sic itaque habebit donum alius alio minus, ut hoc quoque donum habeat, ne velit amplius.—*Jerome* even charged Jovinian with heresy, because he denied the degrees in question, adv. Jov. lib. ii. Opp. T. ii. p. 58, ss.—According to Augustine there are also degrees of condemnation, de civ. Dei xxi. 16: Nequaquam tamen negandum est, etiam ipsum æternum ignem pro diversitate meritorum quamvis malorum aliis leviorem, aliis futurum esse graviorem, sive ipsius vis atque ardor pro pœna digna cujusque varietur (he thus admitted that, relatively speaking, the punishment is not eternal) sive ipse æqualiter ardeat, sed non æquali molestia sentiatur. Comp.

Enchir. ad Laur. § 113. Greg. M. Moral. ix. c. 39, lib. xvi. c. 28. The opinions of the Fathers were most indefinite respecting children that die without being baptized. (Comp. § 137. 5.)

(5) This opinion was principally founded on the use of the word αἰώνιος in Matth. xxv. 41, 46: it must have the same meaning in reference to both life and punishment. Thus *Augustine* says, de civ. Dei xxi. 23: Si utrumque æternum, profecto aut utrumque cum fine diuturnum, aut utrumque sine fine perpetuum debet intelligi. Paria enim relata sunt, hinc supplicium æternum, inde vita æterna. Dicere autem in hoc uno eodemque sensu, vita æterna sine fine erit, supplicium æternum finem habebit, multum absurdum est. Unde, quia vita æterna Sanctorum sine fine erit, supplicium quoque æternum quibus erit, finem procul dubio non habebit. Comp. Enchirid. § 112. It is superfluous to quote passages from other Fathers, inasmuch as they all more or less agree.

(6) Some faint intimations of a belief in the final remission of punishments in the world to come, are to be found in those writings of *Didymus* of Alexandria, which are yet extant, especially in his treatise de trinitate, edited by *Mingarelli*, A. D. 1769; comp. *Neander*, Kirchengesch. ii. 3, p. 1407. *Gregory of Nyssa* speaks more distinctly on this point, orat. cat. c. 8, and 35, in his λόγος περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ ἀναστάσεως, and in his treatise de infantibus, qui mature abripiuntur; Opp. T. iii. p. 226–29 and 322, ss. He points out the corrective design of the punishments inflicted upon the wicked. Comp. *Neander*, l. c. *Münscher*, Handbuch iv. p. 465. (Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, endeavoured to suppress these passages, see *Münscher*, l. c.) *Rupp*, p. 261. *Gregory of Nazianzum* entertained (Orat. xl. p. 665, *Ullmann*, p. 505,) but faint hopes of a final remission of the punishments of hell (as φιλανθρωπότερον καὶ τοῦ κολάζοντος ἐπαξίως.) He makes an occasional allusion to the notion of Origen concerning an ἀποκατάστασις, Orat. xxx. 6, p. 544.—*Diodorus of Tarsus* and *Theodore of Mopsuestia* adopted these milder notions. (The passages may be found in Assemani bibl. orient. T. iii. p. 1, p. 223–24. Phot. bibl. cod. lxxxi. p. 200. Mar. Mercator Opp. p. 346, ed. Balluzii.) Comp. *Neander*, l. c. p. 1409. *Augustine* (Enchirid. § 112,) and *Jerome* (ad Avit. Opp. T. ii. p. 103, ad Pammach. p. 112,) refer to these milder views which to some extent prevailed in the West. The lan-

guage of Jerome shows that he was still under the influence of the system to which he formerly adhered, though it is in every respect contrary to the spirit of Origen, when he says (Comment. in Jes. c. lxvi.): et sicut diaboli et omnium negatorum et impiorum, qui dixerunt in corde suo: non est Deus, credimus æterna tormenta, sic peccatorum et impiorum et *tamen* [!] Christianorum, quorum opera in igne probanda sunt atque purganda, moderatam arbitramur et mixtam clementiæ sententiam. "*This impious opinion, according to which all who were not Christians, were condemned to everlasting torments, but all slothful and immoral Christians lulled asleep in carnal security, could not fail to gain many friends*" *Münscher*, Handbuch iv. p. 473.

(7) *Augustine* indeed firmly maintained the eternity of punishments; but as *Pelagius* had asserted at the synod of Diospolis: in die judicii iniquis et peccatoribus non esse parcendum sed æternis eos ignibus esse exurendos, et si quis aliter credit, Origenista est (comp. § 141, note 3,) he urged milder principles in opposition to him (de gestis Pelagii, c. 3, § 9–11) in accordance with the highest principle: judicium sine misericordia fiet illi, qui non fecit misericordiam. (Comp. also what is said note 4.)

(8) We might have expected that the milder disposition of *Chrysostom* would have induced him to adopt opinions more in accordance with those of his master Diodorus of Tarsus; in Hom. 39, in ep. 1. ad Cor. Opp. x. p. 372, he alludes indeed to the opinion of those who endeavour to prove that 1 Cor. xv. 28, implies an ἀναίρεσις τῆς κακίας, without refuting it. But his position in the church, and the general corruption of morals, compelled him to adopt more rigid views. Comp. in Theodor. lapsum l. c.—in epist. 1. ad Thessal. Hom. 8: Μὴ τῇ μελλήσει παραμυθώμεθα ἑαυτούς· ὅταν γὰρ πάντως δέῃ γενέσθαι, οὐδὲν ἡ μέλλησις ὠφελεῖ· πόσος ὁ τρόμος; πόσος ὁ φόβος τότε; κ. τ. λ. in ep. 2. hom. 3, and other passages.—(On the notions of Origen concerning this point, see § 78, note 6.)

(9 Comp. the acts of the Synod of Constantinople (A. D. 544.) Can. xii. quoted by *Mansi*, T. ix. p. 399.

THIRD PERIOD.

FROM JOHN DAMASCENUS TO THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION—FROM THE YEAR 730—1517.

THE AGE OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY

(SCHOLASTICISM IN THE WIDEST SENSE OF THE WORD.)

A. GENERAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE THIRD PERIOD.

§ 143.

CHARACTER OF THIS PERIOD.

Engelhardt, Dogmengeschichte, vol. ii. *Münscher*, Lehrbuch der Dogmengesch. herausgegeben by *von Cölln*, vol. ii.

A NEW period in the history of doctrines may be said to commence with the publication of the work of *John Damascenus*,(1) a Greek monk, inasmuch as from that time a greater desire was manifested, to arrange systematically, and to prove dialectically that which had been obtained by a series of conflicts.(2) The structure of ecclesiastical doctrine was completed with the exception of a few parts, *e. g.* the doctrine of the sacraments. But its main pillars, viz. *Theology* and *Christology*, were firmly established by means of the decisions of councils held during the preceding period, and Augustinism had given (at least in the West) a definite character to

Anthropology, to the doctrine of salvation connected with it, and, lastly, to the doctrine of the church. The merit of those theologians who still made the doctrine of the church the object of their study, consisted partly in the collection and completion of existing materials, partly in the endeavour to sift them, and partly in the effort made to prove dialectically particular points. Nevertheless they were not devoid of originality and a spirit of investigation.

(1) The title of this work is: ῎Εκδοσις [ἔκθεσις] *ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως* (it forms, properly speaking, the third part of a greater work, entitled *πηγὴ γνώσεως*.) An edition of it was published by Mich. LeQuien. Par. 1712, ii. fol.; see also his Dissertt. vii. Damascenicæ. Comp. *Schröckh*, Kirchengeschichte, vol. xx. p. 222, ss. *Rössler*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, viii. p. 246—532.

(2) We found traces of a systematic treatment during the former two periods in the writings of Origen (*περὶ ἀρχῶν*), and of Augustine (Enchiridion and de doctrina christiana), but they were only traces. "*John Damascenus is undoubtedly the last of the theologians of the eastern church, and remains in later times the highest authority in the theological literature of the Greeks.* HE MAY HIMSELF BE CONSIDERED AS THE STARTING-POINT OF THE SCHOLASTIC SYSTEM OF THE GREEK CHURCH, WHICH IS YET TOO LITTLE KNOWN." *Dorner*, Entwickelungsgeschichte, der Christologie, p. 113. (*Tafel*, Supplementa histor. eccles. Græcor. sec. xi. xii. 1832, p. 3, ss. 9, ss.) On the importance of John Damascenus in relation to the West, see *Dorner*, l. c.

§ 144.

THE RELATION OF THE SYSTEMATICAL TENDENCY TO THE APOLOGETICAL.

The labours of apologists, which had been of less importance even in the preceding period, were naturally limited to a still narrower circle during the present, since Christianity had become almost exclusively the religion of the civilized world. It only remained to combat Mohammedanism and Judaism.(1) German and Slavonic paganism appeared in comparison with Christian civilization as a sort of barbarism, which was opposed not so much with the weapons of scientific discussion, as by the practical efforts of missionaries, and sometimes by physical force.(2) But as Christian philosophers, especially towards the close of the present period, raised doubts concerning the truth of revelation in a more or less open way, apologists were again compelled to enter the lists.(3)

(1) The Jews were combated in the ninth century among others by *Agobard*, archbishop of Lyons, in his works: de insolentia Judæorum—de judaicis superstitionibus. Compare *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxi. p. 300, ss. *Amulo* (Amularius), archbishop of Lyons, in his treatise: contra Judæos; *Schröckh*, l. c. p. 310. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries they were opposed by *Gislebert of Westminster;* he wrote: Disputatio Judæi cum Christiano de fide christiana, in Anselmi Cantuar. Opp. p. 512–523. Par. 1721, fol. *Schröckh*, xxv. p. 358; by *Abelard* in his work: dialogus inter Philos. Judæum et Christianum (*Rheinwald*, Anecdota ad hist. eccles. pertinent. Berol. 1835. T. 1); by *Rupert, Abbot of Duytz:* Annulus seu Dialogus Christiani et Judæi de fidei sacramentis, *Schröckh*, l. c. p. 363, ss; and by *Richard of St Victor*, who wrote de Emmanuele libros duos, *Schröckh*, l. c. p. 366, ss. In the thirteenth century they met with an opponent in the person of *Raimund Martini*, who composed the treatises: pugio fidei, capistrum Judæorum, *Schröckh*, l. c. p. 369, ss. etc. The MOHAMMEDANS were combated by *Euthymius Zigabenus* (in the 24th chapter of his work entitled: πανοπλία, which was edited by *Beurer* in Frid. Sylburgii Saracenicis, Heidelb. 1595. 8); *Raimund Martini* in his treatise: pugio fidei, *Schröckh*, xxv. p. 27, ss.; *Peter the venerable of Clugny*, in his work: advers. nefandam sectam Saracenorum (*Martène*, Collect. ampl. monum. T. ix. p. 1121). *Schröckh*, l. c. p. 34, and xxvii. p. 245: and still later by *Æneas Sylvius* (Pope Pius II.) who wrote: Ep. 410, ad Mahom. II. *Schröckh*, xxxii. p. 291, ss.

(2) Concerning this point compare the works on ecclesiastical history (the chapters on the spread of Christianity.) The same method was partly adopted with reference to the Jews and Mohammedans.

(3) *Savonarola*, Triumphus Crucis, de fidei veritate, 4 books, comp. *Rudelbach*, Hieronym. Savonarola, Hamb. 1835, p. 375, ss. *Marsilius Ficinus*, de rel. Christ. et fidei pietate, opuscul. see *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxxiv. p. 343, ss.

§ 145.

THE POLEMICS OF THIS PERIOD.—CONTROVERSIES WITH HERETICS.

Engelhardt, Dogmengeschichte, vol. ii. ch. 3. p. 51, ss.

The heresies which made their appearance during the present period differed from former heretical tendencies in being opposed to the whole ecclesiastical system rather than to any particular doctrines. With regard to their doctrinal tenets they adopted for the most part the heretical notions of the Gnostics and Manichæans, but sometimes professed to return to the simple and unadulterated doctrine of the Gospel.(1) There were some few heresies of a doctrinal character, *e.g.* the Adoptian heresy, or the theories of Gottschalk and of Berengar, as well as some bold assertions on the part of scholastic theologians (such as Roscelinus and Abelard), which gave rise to controversies within the church, and called forth decisions of synods.(2) It was not until the close of the present period, that struggles against the existing order of things prepared the way for a change in the religious views of the age, and thus introduced the period of the Reformation.(3)

---

(1) To the heretical sects belong in the East the *Paulicians* comp. § 85, note 4,) and the *Bogomiles* (concerning their doctrinal tenets, compare *Mich. Psellus*, περὶ ἐνεργείας δαιμόνων διάλ.

ed. Hasenmüller. Kil. 1688.—*Euthym. Zigabenus*, Panoplia P. ii. tit. 23. *Wolf, J. Ch.*, hist. Bogomilorum Dss. iii. vit. 1712, 4. **Engelhardt*, kirchenh. Abhandlungen, Erl. 1832, No. 2.); in the West the *Cathari* (Leonistæ), *Manichæans* (Paterini, Publicani, Bugri, boni homines,) the followers of *Peter of Bruis*, and *Henry of Lausanne* (Petrobrusiani, Henriciani); and in later times, the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*, the *Turlupines*, the *Beghards*, *Beguines*, *Fraticelli*, *Spirituales*, etc. Compare the works on ecclesiastical history, especially *Füsslin*, Kirchen und Ketzerhistorie der mittlern Zeiten, Frankfort and Leipzig 1770, ss. iii. (The history of doctrines can consider these sects only in general.) *Mosheim*, de Beghardis et Beguinabus. Lips. 1790, 8.

(2) Comp. the sections on Trinity, Christology, Predestination, and the Lord's Supper, in the special history of doctrines.

(3) See the works on ecclesiastical history, and *Flathe*, Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation. Leipz. 1835, ii. (comp. § 155.)

§ 146.

THE GREEK CHURCH.

* *Ullmann*, Nicolaus von Methone, Euthymius Zigabenus und Nicetas Choniates oder die dogmatische Entwickelung der griechischen Kirche im 12ten Jahrhundert, (Studien und Kritiken 1833, part 3, p. 647, ss.) *W. Gass*, Gennadius und Pletho, Aristotelismus und Platonismus in der griechischen Kirche, uebst einer Abhandlung über die Bestreitung des Islam im Mittelalter, Bresl. 1844.

After the appearance of Augustine in the preceding period, the Greek church had ceased to be more important than the western in the dogmatic point of view; in the present it made no further advance after the death of John Damascenus. The theologians who followed John Damascenus, such as *Euthymius Zigabenus*,(1) *Nicholas, bishop of Methone*,(2) and *Nicetas Choniates*,(3) were but the shadows of former grandeur, and may be compared to the scholastic divines of the West. The principal doctrinal writers among the Chaldean Christians (the followers of Nestorius), were *Ebed Jesu*, (4) among the Jacobites (Monophysites), *Jacob, bishop of Tagritum,*(5) and *Abulfaradsh.*(6)

(1) He is also called *Zigadenus*, and died about the year 1118, a monk at Constantinople. At the request of the Emperor Alexis Comnenus, he wrote his principal work: Πανοπλία δογματικὴ τῆς ὀρϑοδόξου πίστεως ἤτοι ὁπλοϑήκη δογμάτων, see *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxix. p. 332, ss. 373, and *Ullmann*, l. c. p. 19, ss. The original work was only once printed at Tergovisto, in Wallachia, in the year 1711. Comp. Fabric. Bibl. gr. vol. vii. p. 461. There is a Latin translation of it by *Pet. Franc. Zino*, Venet. 1555. fol., which was reprinted in Maxima Bibl. PP. Lugd. T. xix. p. i. ss.—He also composed exegetical treatises.

(2) Methone was a town in Messenia. Concerning his life little is known. Some maintain that he lived in the eleventh century, others assert with more probability that he lived in the twelfth; comp. *Ullmann*, l. c. p. 57. His principal work is the refutation of *Proclus*, a Platonic philosopher, entitled: Ἀνάπτυξις τῆς ϑεολογικῆς στοιχειώσεως Πρόκλου Πλατωνικοῦ; it was edited by Director *Vœmel*, Frankf. on the Maine, 1825, 8. To this must be added: Nicol. Meth. Anecdoti, P. i. et ii 1825, 26. "*The work of Nicolas of Methone is undoubtedly one of the best writings of that time.*" Ullmann, l. c. With regard to the history of doctrines, his discussions on the atonement are of the greatest importance, (§ 179.)

(3) His family name was *Acominatus*. He was called Choniates after his native town Chonæ (formerly Colosse) in Phrygia; he died after the year 1206.—Of his Θησαυρὸς ὀρϑοδοξίας in 27 books, only the first five (and probably the most important) are known in the Latin translation of *Morelli*, published Par. 1569. 8; and reprinted in Max. Bibl. PP. T. xxv. p. 54, ss. This work was intended to complete the Panoplia of Euthymius. Comp. *Schröckh*, xxix. p. 338, ss. *Ullmann*, p. 30, ss.

(4) He was bishop of Nisibis, and died A. D. 1318. Concerning his treatise: Margarita sive de vera fide, comp. *Assemani*, Bibl. orient. T. iii. P. i. (An extract of it is given by *Pfeifer*, vol. ii. p. 407.)

(5) He died A. D. 1231. On his work: Liber Thesaurorum see *Assemani*, l. c. T. ii. p. 237. (*Pfeifer*, vol. i. p. 250.)

(6) He occupied the metropolitan see of Edessa, was also

called Barhebræus, and died A. D. 1286. On his work: Candelabrum Sanctorum de fundamentis, see *Assemani*, l. c. p. 284.

§ 147.

THE WESTERN CHURCH.

Bossuet, Einleitung in die Allgemeine Geschichte der Welt bis auf Kaiser Karl den Grossen, übersetzt und mit einem Anhange historisch-kritischer Abhandlungen vermehrt von *J. A. Cramer*, 7 vols. Lipz. 1757–1786.

During the former two periods the western church was principally represented by the ecclesiastical writers of Gaul and Italy, as well as by the theologians of the African school. When the renown of the latter writers, as well as the glory of the Roman and Greek empires had passed away, a new system of Christian theology developed itself among the *Germanic* nations. We have here to distinguish three leading periods: I. The age of the *Carlovingians*, inclusive of the periods before and after, until the commencement of the scholastic period. II. The age of Scholasticism proper (from the eleventh century to the middle of the fifteenth.) III. The period of transition to the Reformation (the fifteenth century, and especially the second half of it.)

It is of course impossible to draw distinct lines of separation. Thus scholasticism is represented in the period mentioned as the first by John Scotus Erigena; the second period merges so gradually into the third, that for some time both tendencies (the scholastic, which was fast disappearing, and that which manifested itself in the writings of the Reformers) accompanied each other.

§ 148.

THE AGE OF THE CARLOVINGIANS.

*† *Staudenmaier*, Johann Scotus Erigena und die Wissenschaft seiner Zeit. First Part, Frankfort on Main, 1834. *Kuntsmann*, Hrabanus Magnentius Maurus, Mainz. 1841. *Ritter*, Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. vii.

The collection of sentences composed by *Isidore of Seville*, and others of similar import,(1) presented the rough material, while the schools and colleges founded by Charlemagne contributed to call forth spiritual activity. The *venerable Bede*,(2) and *Alcuin*(3) were distinguished for the clearness of their views among the number of those who exerted more or less influence upon the age of the Carlovingians, though they did not go so far as to set forth any connected system of theology. *Claudius, bishop of Turin*, (4) and *Agobard, archbishop of Lyons*,(5) also exerted a greater influence by arousing the minds of the people, and promoting practical reforms, than by investigations of a strictly doctrinal character. It was only the ecclesiastical controversies of the age which called forth a more distinct display of theological ingenuity.(6) *John Scotus Erigena*, however, shone as a bright star in the theological firmament. Being possessed of high spiritual originality, he endeavoured, after the manner of Origen, to demonstrate theology in a philosophical manner, but his speculative tendency led him at the same time into dangerous errors.(7)

(1) Comp. § 82, note 30. In addition to Isidore, we may mention as compilers of the seventh century: *Tajo* of Saragossa, who lived about the year 650, and *Ildefonsius* of Toledo, who lived between A. D. 659, and 669. Comp. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln. ii. p. 5.

(2) He was born about the year 672, and died A. D. 735, in England. He is celebrated as a historian, and by his efforts for the promotion of education among the clergy. His com-

mentaries, sermons, and epistles, contain much that is of importance in the history of doctrines. *Schröckh,* Kirchengesch. xx. p. 126. ss. Allgemeine Encyclopædie, viii. p. 308—12. His works were published Paris 1544. 1554. Bas. 1563. Colon. 1612, 1688, viii. fol.

(3) He is also known by the names Flaccus Albinus, and Alschwinus; he was born in the county of York, became tutor of Charlemagne, and died A. D. 804. His work entitled: de fide sanctæ et individuæ Trinitatis in 3 books, contains a complete system of theology. Comp. *Bossuet,* transl. by Cramer, vol. v. sect. 2, p. 552—59. Concerning the part which he took in the Adoptian controversy, etc., see the special history of doctrines. Comp. Alcuins Leben von *F. Lorenz.* Halle 1829, 8. *Schröckh,* Kirchengesch. xix. p. 77, ss. 419, ss. xx. p. 113, ss. 217, ss. 348, 585, ss. *Neander,* Kirchengesch. iii. p. 154, and elsewhere. His works were published by *J. Frobenius,* Ratisb. 1777, ii. fol.

(4) He was a native of Spain (perhaps a disciple of Felix of Urgella), adopted the doctrinal tenets of Augustine, was a teacher during the reign of Lewis the Pious, and died A. D. 840. His commentaries contain much dogmatical matter. Comp. *Schröckh* l. c. xxiii. p. 281. *Neander,* l. c. iv. p. 325, ss.

(5) He was born A. D. 779, and died A. D. 840. He opposed, like Claude, many of the superstitions of the age. Concerning his polemical writings against the Jews, see § 144; on his refutation of Felix of Urgella, comp. the special history of doctrines. Comp. also *Schröckh,* l. c. xxiii. p. 249. *Neander,* l. c. iv. p. 322—24. His works were published Par. 1605, 8.

(6) This was the case with *Rabanus Maurus, Paschasius Radbert, Ratramnus, Servatus Lupus, Hinkmar of Rheims, Florus Magister, Fredegis of Tours,* and others in the controversies concerning predestination, the Lord's Supper, etc. On their writings see the works on ecclesiastical history, and *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, ii. p. 6 and 7.

(7) He was also called Scotigena, lived at the court of Charles the Bald, and died after the year 877. Comp. *Hjort,* Scotus Erigena oder von dem Ursprung einer christlichen Philosophie Kopenh. 1823, 8. *Schröckh,* l. c. xxi. p. 208, ss. xxiii. 481—84. *Neander,* iv. p. 388, ss. *Staudenmaier,* l. c. and his essay; Lehre des Joh. Scot. Erig. über das menschl. Erkennen, mit Rücksicht auf einschlägige Theorien früherer und späterer Zeit,

in the Freiburger Zeitschr. für Theol. iii. 2. **Frommüller*, die Lehre des Joh. Scot. Erigena vom Wesen des Bösen. Tüb. Zeitschr. für Theol. 1830. part i. p. 49, ss. part 3, p. 74, ss. His principal writings are: Dialogus de divisione naturæ lib. v. ed. **Th. Gale.* Oxon. 1681.—de prædestinatione Dei.—Of his edition of Pseudo-Dionysius: Opera S. Dionysii latine versa, only the hierarchia cœlestis is extant in the first volume of the works of Hugo of St Victor. "*His profound views concerning the Divine omnipresence and universal revelation, and his opinions on philosophy and religion, which he regarded only as different manifestations of the same spirit, are unequalled, and assign to him so high a place above the times in which he lived, that he was not condemned by the church until the thirteenth century.*" (Hase.)

§ 149.

SCHOLASTICISM IN GENERAL.

**Bulæi* historia Universitatis Parisiensis, Par. 1665—73. vi. fol. *Semler*, Einleitung in die dogmatische Gottesgelehrsamskeit (vor Baumgartens evangelischer Glaubenslehre, vol. i. p. 16, ss.) *Brucker*, historia Philosophiæ Tom. iii. **Tennemann*, Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. viii. and ix. **Hegel*, Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. iii. part 2. *Cramer*, l. c. vol. 5. *Engelhardt*, Dogmengeschichte, p. 14, ss. *Baur*, Lehre von der Versöhnung, p. 142, ss. [*Hampden, R. D.*, the Scholastic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology, in a course of Lectures delivered at the Bampton Lecture. London 1837.]

The exceedingly bold attempts of Scotus Erigena to effect a union between philosophy and theology, remained for some time without imitators, till the efforts of later theologians in the same direction, though in a less free spirit, led to what is commonly called *Scholasticism.*⁽¹⁾ The scholastic divines had not, like the theologians of the earlier Alexandrian school, to trace the philosophical ideas that lay at the basis of that new and vigorous form of religion (Christianity), for the systematical developement of which little had been done. On the contrary, it was their task to lay the foundation of a system of modern Christian philosophy on a system of doctrines which had been handed down from antiquity in a partially corrupt form. (2) But in the absence of an independent philosophical system they had again recourse to ancient philosophy, and formed an alliance with Aristotelianism, quite as unnatural as that, which former theologians had formed with Platonism.(3) Their philosophical inquiries had more regard to form, than to matter, and were of a dialectic rather than of a speculative kind. Hence they were not so much exposed to the danger of letting loose their imagination, and entering upon vague and indefinite discussion (like the Gnostics),(4) as to the adoption of narrow views, and to the danger of wasting their energies upon trifles and minutiæ. Thus a refined and subtile philosophy gradually brought about the downfall of scholasticism. On the other hand, it may be observed, that the endeavours of theologians to arrive at precise theological definitions, their scientific treatment of the doctrines, and the noble confidence which they displayed in the reasonableness of Christianity (notwithstanding existing prejudices), constituted the favourable aspect and the merit of scholasticism.(5) At all events, it is certain, that this grand attempt led to the very opposite of that which was intended, that the freedom of thought was followed by the bondage of the letter the confidence of faith by shameful scepticism.(6)

---

(1) On the appellations Scholasticism etc. see *du Fresne*, p. 739. The derivation of the term in question however is not etymological, but historical. Comp. *Schleiermacher*, Kirchengesch. p. 466, ss.

(2) During the preceding period *Cassiodorus* had given a summary of the dialectics of Aristotle, and *Boëthius* had translated a part of his work entitled Organon. But it was not until the present period that theologians became more generally acquainted with Aristotelianism, see § 151. Platonism, on the other hand, forms as it were the morning and the evening of the philosophy of the middle-ages; the one is represented by Scotus Erigena,

the other by Marsilius Ficinus and others; even during the first period of scholasticism several of its adherents were under the influence of Platonism; it was not till the 13th century that it was supplanted by Aristotelianism.

(3) "*Scholasticism is the progress of the church towards a school, or as Hegel expresses it, though in other words: the Fathers have made the church, because the mind once developed required a developed doctrine; in after ages there were no more patres ecclesiæ, but doctores. The theologians of the primitive church had to create the material, or to expound that which was expressed in its simplest and most direct form in the Christian dogma; they had further to set forth this material in distinct doctrines and formulæ, to present it to the religious world, and to procure its general adoption. Scholasticism, on the contrary, presupposed all this. The material and the contents were given; it became now the task of theologians to effect a reunion between that which, having acquired the nature of an object (in relation to the mind), had been subsequently separated from it, and the mind itself—a union such as would constitute a subjective unity.*" *Baur* Versöhnungslehre, p. 147, 48. Comp. *Baumgarten-Crusius*, Lehrbuch, i. p. 445. *Hegel*, Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. iii. p. 138.

(4) "*Those who compare the systems of Christian theologians with those of the Gnostics, for the most part forget that the systems of the latter have not the connection of philosophical reasoning, but only that of imagination.* *Staudenmaier*, Erigena, p. 370.

(5) As early as the time of Semler complaints were made of the unjust treatment which the scholastic divines had to suffer; Semler himself says: "*The poor scholastici have been too much despised, and that frequently by people, who would not have been good enough to be their transcribers.*" And Luther himself wrote to Staupitz, though he contributed much to the downfall of scholasticism: Ego Scholasticos cum judicio, non clausis oculis lego......*Non rejicio omnia eorum*, sed nec omnia probo, see *de Wette*, i. p. 102. Comp. also *Möhlers* Schriften und Aufsätze, vol. i p. 129, ss. *Ullmann* (Joh. Wessel. p. 12) calls the scholastic theology: "*in its commencement a truly scientific advance upon the past, in its entire course a great dialectic preparatory school of Christianity in the West, in its completion a grand, and highly finished production of the human mind.*"

(6) See *Baur*, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, P. 11. p. 154, ss.

§ 150.

THE PRINCIPAL SCHOLASTIC SYSTEMS.

a. I. *Period of Scholasticism to the time of Peter Lombard.*

Scholasticism took its rise in the monastic schools founded by Charlemagne and his successors. It was principally cultivated in the monastery called Bec in Normandy, where *Lanfranc* was a teacher.(1) His disciple, *Anselm of Canterbury*, setting out from belief in the positive creed of the church, sought to attain the elevation of philosophical knowledge, as is manifest from his theory of satisfaction, no less than from his proof of the existence of God.(2) His views on those points, as well as on the reality of general ideas, were opposed by *Roscelinus*,(3) and *Peter Abelard*,(4) the former of whom rested faith (in opposition to the theory of Anselm) on the evidence of perception, while the latter defended nominalism in opposition to realism. *Hildebert a Lavardino* (first bishop of Mans, and afterwards archbishop of Tours,)(5) adhered, like Anselm, with whom he was contemporary, to the positive creed of the church. *Gilbert of Poitiers*, on the contrary, was (like Roscelinus and Abelard) charged with heterodoxy.(6)—A peculiar tendency which connected mysticism with scholasticism, manifested itself in the writings of *William of Champeaux*,(7) the tutor of Abelard, as well as in those of *Hugo of St. Victor*,(8) and *Richard of St. Victor*.(9) After *Robert Pulleyn* and other theologians beside those already named had endeavoured to prove philosophically the doctrine of the church,(10) *Peter Lombard* (who lived in the twelfth century) collected the existing materials in his " Sentences," and by his peculiar mode of treatment gave rise to that stiff and heavy method which was for a considerable time adopted by theologians in general.(11)

(1) He died A. D. 1089. He came into notice principally by his controversy with *Berengar*, as will be more fully shown in the special history of doctrines. His works were published by d'Achery, Paris, 1648, fol. Comp. *Möhler*, gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze. Regensburg, 1839, i. p. 39.—On the foundation of the monastery Bec, comp. Möhler, l. c.

(2) He was born at Aosta, in Piedmont, about the year 1034, occupied the see of Canterbury from the year 1093 (whence he is called Cantuariensis), and died A. D. 1109. Of his philosophical writings the most important is the work entitled: Monologium et Prologium (it contains a proof of the existence of God, and the doctrine of the Trinity.) Extracts from it are given by *Cramer*, v. 2, p. 341–372. Among his theological works we may mention: de casu Diaboli, but especially the treatise: Cur Deus homo? lib. ii. (which contains a theory of the incarnation of Christ, and the redemption of man.) In addition to these works he wrote: de conceptu virginali et originali peccato, de libero arbitrio, de concordia præscientiæ et prædestinationis nec non gratiæ Dei cum libero arbitrio, etc.—Opp. ed. **Gabr. Gerberon.* Par. 1675, f. 1721, ii. f. (Ven. 1744.) A manual edition of the treatise: Cur Deus homo, was published by *Heyder*, Erl. 1834. 8. Concerning his life and works, comp. *†*Möhler*, gesammelte Schriften und Aufsätze. Regensb. 1839, i. p. 32, ss; on his doctrines, comp. Möhler, l. c. p. 129, ss.—*Bilroth, I. G. F.* de Anselmi Cantuariensis Proslogio et Monologio. Lips. 1832. 8. *Frank*, Anselm von Canterbury, Tüb. 1842, and *J. A. Hasse*, Anselm von Canterbury, I. part. Lps. 1843.

(3) He is also called Rucelinus or Ruzelin; he was born in Lower Brittany, and was canon at Compiègne in the eleventh century. He is commonly regarded as the founder of the nominalists; see *Chladenii* Diss. hist. eccles. de vita et hæresi Roscelini. Erl. 1756. 4. On the contrast between nominalism and realism, which is more fully discussed in works on the history of philosophy, see *Baumgarten-Crusius*, de vero Scholasticorum Realium et Nominalium discrimine et sententia theologica. Jen. 1821. 4. *Engelhardt*, Dogmengeschichte, p. 16, 17, and the essay, mentioned note 4, p. 73, ss. This contrast was not without some

importance for theology, as will be more particularly seen in the doctrine of the Trinity. The part which theologians took in the work of reformation *(e. g.* in the times of Huss), depended, generally speaking, more or less on the views which they adopted with regard to either of the said systems.

(4) He was born A. D. 1079 at Palais near Nantes. Concerning the history of his eventful life, see *Bayle*, Dictionnaire, *Gervaise*, *Berington*, *Schlosser*, and others; *Neander*, der heilige Bernhard, p. 112, ss. His *works* were published: Opp. Abælardi et Heloisæ, ed. *Andr. Quercetanus* (Duchesne) Par. 1616, 4, they contain: de fide S. Trinitatis s. Introductio ad Theologiam in 3 libros divisa.—His Libri V. Theologiæ Christianæ were first edited by *Edm. Martène,* Thesaur. Anecd. T. v. Concerning his Dialogus, see § 144, note 1. The unpublished works of Abelard were edited by *Cousin* in the Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, publiés par ordre du Roi et par les soins du ministre de l'instruction publique. Deuxiéme série: Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard, pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie scolastique en France. Paris 1836, 4. [*Victor Cousin,* über die erste Periode der Scholastik; dem wesentliche historischen Inhalte nach mitgetheilt von I. G. v. *Engelhardt.* Zeitschrift für die historische theologie. Jahrg. 1846, i. p. 56–133.] Comp. also: *Lewald E. A.:* Commentatio de operibus Petri Abælardi, quæ e codicibus manuscriptis Victor Cousin edidit. (Heidelb. 1839, 4.) The judgment of *Cousin* concerning Abelard is as follows: " *As St Bernard represents the conservative spirit and Christian orthodoxy no less by his faults and the narrowness of his views, than by his admirable good sense, his depth without subtility, and his pathetic eloquence, so Abelard and his school represent in some sense the liberal and innovating spirit of the time, with its frequently deceitful promises, and the unavoidable mixture of good and evil, of sobriety and extravagance.*"—Comp. also *Franck,* ein Beitrag zut Würdigung Abälards, in the Tübinger Zeitschrift 1840, 4, p. 4. According to *Baur* (Trinitäts lehre, II. p. 457), Abelard is more of a dialectic than of a speculative thinker. Concerning the relation in which he stands to Rationalism, comp. the same work, p. 500, 501. *Ritter* (Geschichte der Philosophie, vii. p. 161,) considers him " *less freethinking than imprudent.*"

(5) He was born either A. D. 1055 or 57, and died A. D. 1134. Though a disciple of Berengar, he did not adopt all his views.

He was bishop of Mans from the year 1097, and raised to the archiepiscopal dignity A. D. 1125. For some time he was thought to be the author of the Tractatus theol., which modern researches have assigned to Hugo of St Victor (see note 8.) Comp. *Liebner*, in the theolog. Studien und Kritiken 1831, part 2, p. 254, ss.—His opinions on the Lord's Supper are also of importance, as will be seen in the special history of doctrines.

(6) He was also called Porretanus or Porseta, and died A. D. 1154. Concerning his life and works comp. *Otto Fresing*, de gestis Friderici, Lib. i. c. 46, 50–57. *Cramer*, vi. p. 530–552. His principal opponent was *St Bernard, abbot of Clairval* (Clairvaux), who had also combated Roscelinus and Abelard. See *Neander*, der heilige Bernhard, p. 217, ss.

(7) Guilelmus de Campellis; he died A. D. 1121. He was the founder of the school of *St. Victor*, in one of the suburbs of Paris (A. D. 1109), from which, generally speaking, the *mystical* scholastics came. Respecting his person and dialectics see *Schlosser*, Abhandlung über den Gang der Studien in Frankreich, vorzüglich von der Schule zu St. Victor, in his Vincenz von Beauvais. Frankfurt, A. M. 1819, vol. 2, p. 35, and the edition of Abelard's works by Cousin; comp. also *Engelhardt* in the work mentioned, note 9, p. 308, ss.

(8) According to Pagi he died A. D. 1140, according to others A. D. 1141. He was Count of Blankenburg, canon of St. Victor (alter Augustinus, lingua Augustini, Didascalus), and a friend of St. Bernard. Comp. **Leibner, A.*, Hugo von St. Victor und die theologischen Richtungen seiner Zeit. Leipz. 1832. 8. Opp. ex rec. Canonicorum Regularium S. Victoris Paris. Rotomagi, 1648, iii. f. His most important work is: de sacramentis christianæ fidei libri duo, T. iii. p. 487–712. Extracts from it are given by *Cramer*, vi. p. 791–848.

(9) Magnus Contemplator! He was a native of Scotland, and died A. D. 1173. Comp. **Engelhardt*, Richard von S. Victor und Johannes Ruysbroek, zur Geschichte der myst. Theol. Erl. 1838. Opp. studio Canonicorum S. Victoris. Rotomagi 1650, ss.

(10) He was cardinal, and died between the years 1144 and 1150. He wrote: Sententiar. libr. viii., published by Mathoud, Par., 1655, fol. Comp. *Cramer*, l. c. vi. p. 442–529.

(11) Magister Sententiarum. He was born at Novara, raised to the episcopal see of Paris in the year 1159, and died A. D. 1164. His work: Sententiarum libri iv. from p. 431, edited by *J. Aleaume*

1477. Venet. Louvain, 1546. "*It was not so much on account of the ingenuity and depth displayed in the work in question, as in consequence of the position which its author occupied in the church, of his success in removing contrasts, and of its general perspicuity, that it became the manual of the twelfth century, and the model of the subsequent one.*" *Hase.* A specimen of his method is given by *Semler* in his introduction to Baumgarten's Glaubenslehre, vol. ii. p. 81, ss. *Heinrich*, Geschichte der dogmatischen Lehrarten, p. 145, ss. The first book treats: de mysterio Trinitatis, s. de Deo uno et trino; the second: de rerum corporalium et spiritualium creatione et formatione aliisque pluribus eo pertinentibus; the third: de incarnatione verbi aliisque ad hoc spectantibus; and the fourth: de sacramentis et signis sacramentalibus. Comp. *Engelhardt*, Dogmengeschichte, p. 22.—"*The period of systematizing scholasticism, and of endless commenting on the sentences of the masters commences with Peter Lombard. This period is, at the same time, the one in which there was no end of questioning and answering, of laying down theses and antitheses, arguments and counter-arguments, of dividing and splitting up the matter of the doctrines ad infinitum.*" *Baur*, l. c. p. 214. "*It was owing to him that the scholastic treatment of the doctrines assumed that more steady, well regulated form of developement in which it could be carried out to its legitimate consequences without being disturbed by opponents.*" *Baur*, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, p. 159.

§ 151.

b. II. *Period to the End of the Thirteenth Century.*

The dogmatical works of *Robert of Melun*(1) (*Folioth*) and *Alanus of Ryssel*(2) (ab Insulis) appeared about the same time, while *Peter of Poitiers*,(3) a disciple of Peter Lombard, followed in the steps of his master. But their opinions also met with opposition, especially on the part of *Walter of St. Victor*,(4) and *John of Salisbury*.(5) Nevertheless scholasticism gained ground, partly in consequence of external contingencies. In the *first* place, the orders of the mendicant friars acquired a greater influence over the philosophical and theological studies pursued in the universities. And, *secondly,* by means of that more extensive intercourse with the East, which followed the crusades, the western theologians, from the thirteenth century onwards, became acquainted with a more complete edition of the works of Aristotle, which had been translated and commented on by the Arabs, and exerted from that time a still more decided influence upon their systems.(6) The works called " Sums," the first of which was composed by *Alexander Hales,*(7) now occupied the place of the " Sentences." *Albertus Magnus* wrote the first complete commentary on the works of Aristotle.(8) But when scholasticism had reached its height towards the close of the thirteenth century, a division broke out between the different schools, which continued to exist as long as the system itself. The leader of the one of these schools was *Thomas Aquinas,* (9) a Dominican monk, the leader of the other was his opponent, *John Duns Scotus,*(10) a Franciscan monk. The scholastic disputes were connected with the jealousies of the religious orders ;(11) but even in the present period the mystical tendency was sometimes united with the scholastic, as in the case of *John of Fidanza*(12) (Bonaventura), a Franciscan monk.

(1) He was bishop of Hereford from the year 1164, and died A. D. 1195. He composed a Summa Theologie (hitherto unpublished) ; comp. *Bulæus*, l. c. T. ii. 264. 585, ss. 772. 73. *Cramer,* l. c. vi. p. 553–586.

(2) He was called Doctor universalis, and died A. D. 1203. He belonged to the speculative school of Anselm, and composed the following works: Summa quadripartita de fide catholica (a controversial writing, in which he opposed the Albigenses, Waldenses, Jews, and Mohammedans.)—Libri V. de arte s. articulis catholicæ fidei, edited by *Pez.* Thesaur. anecd. noviss. T. i. p. ii. p. 475–504, (an abridgment of it is given by *Cramer,* v. 2. p. 445–459.) and Regulæ theologicæ. —Comp. *Schleiermacher,* Kirchengeschichte, p. 527, ss.

(3) He died A. D. 1205. His Libri V. Sententiarum were edited by *Mathoud*. Paris, 1655, fol. together with the sentences of Pulleyn (see § 150, note 10.) Comp. *Cramer*, vi. p. 754–790.

(4) He lived about the year 1180, and wrote: Libri IV. contra manifestas et damnatas etiam in Conciliis hæreses, quas Sophistæ Abælardus, Lombardus, Petrus Pictavinus et Gilbertus Porretanus, quatuor Labyrinthi Galliæ, uno spiritu Aristotelico efflati, libris sententiarum suarum acuunt, limant, roborant. Extracts from this work (hitherto unpublished) are given by *Bulæus*. l. c. Tit. ii.p. 629—660.

(5) Sarisberiensis; he was bishop of Chartres from the year 1176, and died A. D. 1182. About the year 1156 he addressed to Thomas Becket: Policraticus, sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum, libri viii. This work was followed by Metalogici libri iv. published Lugd. Bat. 1639, 8. Amst. 1664, 8.—Epistolæ cccii. (which were written from 1155—1180,) ed. *Papirius Masson*, Par. 1611, 4. Comp. Bibl. Patr. max. Lugd. T. xxiii. *Schleiermacher*, l. c. p. 527. *Hermann Reuter*, Johan von Salisbury, zur geschichte der christlichen Wissenschaft im 12. Jahrhundert, Berl. 1842.

(6) Notwithstanding ecclesiastical prohibitions, the study of Aristotle gradually gained ground. On the historical developement of these studies see *Amad. Jourdain*, Recherches critiques sur l'âge et l'origine des traductions latines d'Aristote, et sur les commentaires grecs ou arabes, employés par les docteurs scholastiques. Par. 1819, 8, and the works on the history of Philosophy. *Tennemann* viii. p. 353.

(7) Alexander Alesius; he was called Doctor irrefragabilis, and died A. D. 1245. He was the first theologian who made a general use of the Aristotelian philosophy. His work entitled: Summa universæ Theologiæ (divided into quæstiones, membra, and articuli), was edited after his death by *Guilelmus de Melitona* about the year 1252, by order of Pope Innocent IV. Other editions are those of Venice 1576, and of Colon. 1622, iv. fol. Extracts from it are given by *Semler*, l. c. p. 120, ss. *Cramer* vii. p. 161, ss. *Heinrich* p. 208, ss. Comp. *Schleiermacher*, p. 531–32.

(8) He was the most learned of all the scholastics, a native of Suabia, taught at Paris and Cologne, was bishop of Ratisbon, and died at Cologne 1280. Opp. ed. *Petrus Jammy*, Ord. Præd. Lugd. 1651. xxi. T. Fol. Among his numerous

works we mention his Commentaries on Aristotle and Peter Lombard, as well as his Summa Theol. (ex edit. Basil. 1507, ii.)

(9) He is known by the name Doctor angelicus; he was born A. D. 1224, in the kingdom of Naples, taught at Paris, Rome, Bologna, and Pisa, and died A. D. 1274, on his journey to the council of Lyons. He was canonized by Pope John XXII. A. D. 1323. His principal works are: Commentarii in libros iv. Sententiar. Petri Lombardi c. notis *J. Nicolai*, Par. 1659, iv. fol.—Summa totius theologiæ in 3 partes distributa. Extracts from these works are given by *Semler*, l. c. p. 58, ss. *Cramer*, vii. p. 161, ss. *Heinrich*, p. 219, ss. *Schröckh*, xxix. p. 71—196. Opp. omnia. Romæ 1572, xvii. fol. Antverp. 1575. Venet. 1745, xx. fol. For further particulars see *Münscher* edit. by von Cölln, ii. p. 19. Comp. *Ch. F. Kling*, descriptio Summæ theologicæ Thomæ Aquinatis succincta, Bonn. 1846–4.

(10) Duns Scotus, surnamed Doctor subtilis, was born at Dunston in Northumberland, lectured on theology at Oxford from the year 1301, at Paris from the year 1304, and died at Cologne A. D. 1308. He introduced a number of barbarous technical terms, such as quidditates, hæcceitates, incircumscriptibilitates, etc., and was thus the originator of all the scholastic subtilities. His complete works were edited by *Luc. Wadding*, Lugd. 1639. xii. fol. His principal work is: Quodlibeta et Commentaria in libros iv. sententiarum. To this may be added: Quæstiones quodlibeticæ. Comp. *Semler*, l. c. p. 68–73. *Cramer*, vii. p. 295–308. *Heinrich*, p. 226, ss. *Schröckh*, xxix. p. 237, ss.

(11) In the formal point of view the systems of Thomas and of Scotus differ in this, that the former has regard rather to the scientific, the latter to the practical aspect of religion, *Ritter*, viii. p. 365, 66. The speculative tendency of the Thomists accounts for their desire to ascribe reality to ideas; while the Scotists, resting on the foundation of experience, manifest a stronger leaning towards nominalism. The former take more profound views of the relation between Divine grace and human liberty (Augustinism); the latter laying (in the manner of Pelagius) greater stress upon the freedom of the will, advanced notions which commended themselves better to common sense and the interests of morality. And, lastly, the same difference respecting the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin, which caused a bitter enmity between the two orders, also existed between the two schools.

(12) John of Fidanza, surnamed Doctor seraphicus, and called Eutychius, or Eustachius by the Greeks, was Doctor Theol. Parisiensis and Præpositus generalis of the order of the Franciscans, died A. D. 1274 as cardinal, and was canonized A. D. 1482 by Pope Sixtus IV.—Opp. Romæ 1588–96. viii. f. Mogunt. 1609...His principal works are: Commentarius in libros iv. Sententiarum, Breviloquium, Centiloquium. He is also said to be the author of the work entitled: Compendium theologicæ veritatis (de natura Dei.) He wrote several mystical tracts: Speculum animæ, Itinerarium mentis in Deum—de reductione artium ad Theologiam. Comp. *Semler*, l. c. p. 52–58. *Heinrich*, p. 214, ss.

§ 152.

c. III. PERIOD.—*The Decline of Scholasticism in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries.*

During the last period of scholasticism, which was now on the decline, we meet with but few independent thinkers, among whom the most distinguished were *Durand of St. Pourçain,*(1) *Raimund of Sabunde,*(2) and *William Ockam,*(3) a nominalistic sceptic. *Gabriel Biel,*(4) a disciple of the last mentioned, but possessed of less originality than his master, was the last of the scolastic divines, though the corrupt tendency of scholasticism itself continued to exist, and called forth a stronger desire for an entire reformation in theology.(5)

(1) Durandus de Sancto Portiano (a village in the diocese of Clermont,) surnamed Doctor resolutissimus, was from the year 1312 professor of theology in the university of Paris, and afterwards bishop of Annecy and of Meaux. He wrote: Opus super sententias Lombardi Par. 1508. Venet. 1571, fol. (it is now scarce.)—Though a Dominican monk, he ventured to oppose Thomas, on which account he was looked upon as an apostate by the genuine followers of Thomas; see *Cramer*, vol. vii. p. 801, ss.

(2) He was teacher at Toulouse about the year 1436, and composed a work on natural theology under the title: Liber creaturarum, seu Theol. naturalis. Argent. 1496, fol. Fcf. 1635.

8. It was republished in a somewhat altered form by *Amos Comenius* under the title: Oculus fidei. Amst. 1661, 8. Comp. *Montaigne*, Essais, L. ii. c. 12. *Matzke*, die natürliche Theologie des Raymundus von Labunde, Bresl. 1846.

(3) Ockam died A. D. 1347. Though a Franciscan monk, he differed from Duns Scotus, as Durand did from Thomas: in both these cases, therefore, the strict connection before spoken of between the spirit of the order, and the spirit of the school, is destroyed. Ockam took an independent position even in opposition to the Popes (John XXII.), by defending the doctrine of the poverty of Christ; on this point see the works on ecclesiastical history. Respecting his merits as a scholastic divine, he brought nominalism again into repute. Of his works the following are dogmatical: Compendium errorum Joh. XXII., in Goldast. monarchia. Han. 1612, p. 957. Quodlibeta vii. Tract. de sacramento altaris.—Centiloquium theologicum (the last of which, in particular, contains a great many subtilties.) See *Cramer* vii. p. 812, ss. On his ironical scepticism, which he knew how to conceal under the mask of the most rigid orthodoxy, see *Rettberg* in the Studien und Kritiken, 1839, part 1. His works abound with absurd questions, (such as those mentioned in note 5.) Comp. *Rettberg*, p. 80.

(4) He was born at Spire, was professor of philosophy and theology, in the University of Tübingen, and died A. D. 1495.—He wrote:—Collectorium s. Epitome ex Gulielmo Occam in iv. libros Magistri sententiarum ed. *Wend. Steinbach.* Tub. 1502, ii. f. Biel was followed by *Antoninus Florentinus* and *Paul Cortesius*, see *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 30, Cajetan, Eck and others, who lived at the time of Luther, were also perfect scholastics.

(5) Thus it was asked: Num possibilis propositio, Pater Deus odit filium? Num Deus potuerit suppositare mulierem, num diabolum, num asinum, num cucurbitam, num silicem? Tum quemadmodum cucurbita fuerit concionatura, editura miracula, figenda cruci? Et quid consecrasset Petrus, si consecrasset eo tempore, quo corpus Christi pendebat in cruce?..." Sunt innumerabiles λεπτολεσχίαι his quoque multo subtiliores, de instantibus, de notionibus, de relationibus, de formalitatibus, de quidditatibus, de ecceïtatibus, quas nemo possit oculis assequi, nisi tam Lynceus, ut ea quoque per altissimas tenebras videat, quæ nusquam sunt." *Erasmi* stultitiæ laus Bas. 1676, p. 141, ss. and in Annotation. in 1 Tim. i. 6, etc. Com. *Ad. Müller*, Erasmus, p.

155, and *Gieseler*, l. c. ii. § 144, note g. Respecting the decline of scholasticism, Luther wrote to John Lange at Erfurt: Aristoteles descendit paulatim, inclinatus ad ruinam propre futuram sempiternam: mire fastidiuntur lectiones sententiariæ, nec est ut quis sibi auditores sperare possit, nisi theologiam hanc, i. e. Bibliam aut S. Augustinum aliumve ecclesiasticæ auctoritatis doctorem velit profiteri. The letter in question is reprinted in *de Wette's* Collection, I. No. 34, p. 57. Comp. the sixtieth letter (addressed to Staupitz) p. 102.

§ 153.

MYSTICISM.

**Schmid, H.*, der Mysticismus des Mittelalters in seiner Entstehungsperiode, Jena, 1824.—*Schmidt, Charles*, Essai sur les mystiques du quatorzième siécle. Strasburg. 1836. 4. [*Helfferich*, die Geschichte der christlichen Mystic in ihrer Entwickelung und in ihren Denkmalen. 2 vols. Hamb. 1843.] *Tranz. Pfeifer*, deutsche Mystiken des 14. Jahrhunderts. 1 vol. Lpz. 1845.

The influence of scholasticism was beneficially counterbalanced by *Mysticism*, which in effusions of the heart, rich indeed, though at times indistinct, restored to theology those vital streams of which it had been deprived by the all-absorbing influence of dialectic philosophy.(1) Theologians, whose tendency was of a positive kind, such as *Bernard of Clairval*, had before this asserted the importance of a pious disposition, holding fast the orthodox faith, and of a devout turn of mind, in opposition to a speculative tendency.(2) Some of the scholastic divines themselves had endeavoured to reconcile the claims of a pious mind with the demands made by the scientific developement of the age, on which account they are commonly called either mystical scholastics, or dialectical mystics.(3) But about the time of the decline of the scholastic philosophy, mysticism made its appearance in a much more vigorous and independent form, though under very different aspects. As had been the case with the scholastics, so some of the mystics adhered more closely to the doctrine of the church, while others, departing from it, adopted heretical notions.(4) Respecting the scientific treatment of mysticism it may be said, that one class of its advocates manifested a more philosophical turn of mind, and displayed more of the results of preparatory philosophical studies, than was shown by the other. The doctrines of *Master Eckart*(5) had much in common with the enthusiasm of pantheistic sects, and were consequently condemned by the see of Rome. Among those who followed more closely (though with various modifications) the doctrine of the church, we mention: *John Tauler*,(6) *Henry Suso*,(7) *John Ruysbroek*,(8) the (anonymous) author of the "Büchlein von der deutschen Theologie, (*i. e.* the little book on German theology,)(9) *Thomas à Kempis*,(10) and *John Charlier Gerson*;(11) the last mentioned also endeavoured to establish a scientific system of mysticism.

---

(1) *Mysticism forms in itself a contrast to proper Scholasticism, inasmuch as the prevailing tendency of the latter is a dialectical process of the understanding . . . But Mysticism could enter into a union with Scholasticism by creating a desire for preserving the spring of religion in the depth and ardour of the human heart* (Germ. Gefühl), *as the true seat of religion, in order to supply that which could not be furnished by purely dialectical thinking.*" *Baur*, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, p. 167.

(2) He was surnamed Doctor mellifluus, and died A. D. 1153. His works were edited by *Mabillon*, Par. (1666—1690.) 1719, ii. fol Ven. 1726, iii. fol. He wrote epistles, sermons, and mystical tracts: de consideratione, ad Eugenium iii. Papam. Libros v. de gratia et libero arbitrio etc. Comp. **Neander*, der heilige Bernhard und sein Zeitalter. Berlin, 1813, 8. *Ellendorf*, der heilige Bernhard von Clairvaux und die Hierarchie seiner Zeit. Essen. 1837. *H. Schmid*, l. c. p. 187, ss. *De Wette*, Sittenlehre, ii. 2, p. 208, ss.—Practical activity was also displayed by *Berthold*, a Franciscan monk, who lived between the years 1247 and 1272; he bordered upon mysticism. See his sermons, edited

by *Kling*, Berl. 1824, and the review of *Jac. Grimm* in the Wiener Jahrbücher, 1825, p. 194, ss.

(3) To these belong especially *William of Champeaux*, and the theologians of the school of St. Victor, as well as *Bonaventura*. Comp. §§ 150 and 151. There is also a mystical background in the writings of Anselm of Canterbury, Albertus Magnus, and Thomas Aquinas.

(4) *The ideas of the orthodox mystics rest on the positive foundation of the creed, and all the spiritual transactions described by them are most intimately connected with the doctrine of the Trinity, the incarnation of Christ, the influence of the Spirit promised by Christ, and the mystery of the Lord's Supper. The abstract theory of the heretical mystics seeks to fathom the depth of the soul, which in their opinion is nothing but God himself; they teach that sanctification is the work of man himself, and regard the said positive doctrines as at most the symbols of those spiritual transactions on which the accomplishment of the design of our life depends.* IT IS OF SPECIAL IMPORTANCE IN AN EXPOSITION OF THE HISTORY OF THIS PERIOD, DISTINCTLY TO SEPARATE THESE TWO KINDS OF ORTHODOX AND HETERODOX MYSTICS." *Engelhardt*, Richard von S. Victor, p. 2. Comp. p. 97, 98.

(5) ***Amalrich of Bena*** and ***David of Dinanto*** had previously developed the fanatical aspect of the mystico-pantheistic system of John Scotus Erigena, and given to it that dangerous practical direction, which is exhibited to a singular extent by some later sects of the middle ages. Comp. *H. Schmid*, l. c. p. 387, ss. *Engelhardt*, kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen. Erlang. 1832, p. 251. *Mosheim*, de Beghardis et Beguinabus, p. 211, ss. p. 255.—Among the mystics of the fourteenth century. ***Master Eckart*** (Aichard) a native of Saxony, and provincial of the order of the Dominicans in Cologne, bears most resemblance to the aforesaid theologians, though he surpasses them by a more spiritual perception and a more scientific culture of mind. "*His sense of the nearness of God, and his ardent love are overwhelmed by the contemplation of an abyss of lusts and blasphemy.*" (*Hase.*) His doctrines were condemned, A. D. 1329, in a bull of Pope John XXII. Comp. *Schmidt, Charles*, Essai, p. 51—57, and Studien und Kritiken, 1839. 3. *Mosheim*, l. c. p. 280. Sprüche deutscher Mystiker in *Wackernagel's* Lesebuch, i. Sp.

889—92. [*Meister Eckart.* Eine theologische Studie von *H. Martensen.* Hamb. 1843.]

(6) He was called Doctor sublimis et illuminatus, lived as a monk of the order of the Dominicans at Cologne and Strasburg, and died A. D. 1361. He was a clever preacher. A Latin translation of his works was edited by *Laur Surius,* Col. 1548. He wrote, among others: Nachfolge des armen Lebens Christi.—Medulla animæ (a collection of divers tracts,) Sermons iii. Leipz. 1826, etc. Comp. *Wackernagel's* deutsches Lesebuch Sp. 857, ss. [*Schmidt, Carl,* Johannes Tauler von Strasburg. Beitrag zur Geschichte der Mystik und des religiösen Lebens im 14, Jahrhundert.] Luther wrote concerning him to Spalatin (14 Dec. 1516.): Si te delectat puram, solidam, antiquæ simillimam theologiam legere, in germanica lingua effusam, sermones Johannis Tauleri, prædicatoriæ professionis, tibi comparare potes...... Neque enim ego vel in latina vel in nostra lingua theologiam vidi salubriorem et cum Evangelio consonantiorem. The letter is given by *de Wette,* vol. i. No. 25, p. 46. *De Wette,* on the contrary, says (christliche Sittenlehre ii. 2, p. 220, ss.): "*His mysticism is very profound and fervent, and at the same time very speculative; but it possesses no intrinsic worth, inasmuch as it is almost exclusively of a negative description, and consists only of a renunciation of all that is earthly and finite. On the contrary, the true, the essential, the divine is, as it were, an empty space, because it is not brought into any definite relation to the life and heart of man,*" etc.

(7) Henry Suso (Germ. der Seuse, sometimes called Amandus vom Berg) was born at Constance, and died A. D. 1365. His works were translated into Latin by *Laur. Surius* Col. 1532.—Comp. Heinrich Suso's Leben und Schriften, herausgegeben von *†*Melch Diepenbrock* mit einer Einleitung von *Görres.* 1829, 37, 40, Geistliche Blüthen von Suso. 1834. *Wackernagel,* deutsches Lesebuch Sp. 871, ss. He is more poetical than profound and speculative, his writings are full of allegories and imagery, frequently fantastical, but often full of religious ardour. A child-like soul! He is not to be confounded with the author of the work on the nine rocks (Rulman Mersurin), comp. *Ch. Schmidt,* in Illgens Zeitschrift 1839. 2. An important contribution to the history of mysticism is the treatise of *W. Wackenagel* über die Gottesfreunde in Basel 1843.

(8) He was prior of the regular canons in Gruenthal in Bra-

bant, and died A. D. 1381. He was surnamed Doctor ecstaticus. His works (originally written in the Flemish language) were translated into Latin by *Laur. Surius.* Cologne 1552, 1609, 1692, and into German by *Gottfr. Arnold*, Offenbach, 1701. 4. Comp. **Engelhardt* in the work mentioned § 150, note 9.—Ruysbroek holds the medium between the orthodox and the heterodox mystics; *Ch. Gerson*, who wrote against him, numbered him among the latter; but comp. *Engelhardt*, l. c. p. 275: *The line of demarcation between heterodox and orthodox mysticism, which we find distinctly drawn in the writings of Ruysbroek, was so fine, and might so easily be transgressed, that nothing but a firm adherence to that form of belief which was generally adopted, and sanctioned by the terminology of the Fathers, as well as by the authority of the church, seemed a sufficient guard against errors such as those just mentioned.*"—Comp. *De Wette*, christliche Sittenlehre; he says p. 247: " *In the writings of Ruysbroek [as well as in those of Tauler], the idea of something absolute and of renouncing all that is finite, of being absorbed in the one and undivided, is set forth as that from which all things are derived. Ruysbroek acknowledged, even to a farther extent than Tauler, the indwelling of the Divine in man—an admission of much importance. In a moral aspect the writings of Ruysboek are of more importance than those of Tauler; the former developes more distinctly the nature of a virtuous life, and warns against spiritual sloth, but he has fallen more frequently than Tauler into the error of mystical sensuality and voluptuousness,*" etc.

(9) The full title of this work is: *Deutsche Theologie, oder ein edles Büchlein vom rechten Verstande, was Adam und Christus sei, und wie Adam in uns sterben und Christus in uns leben soll.* It was first published A. D. 1516, by *Luther* (with a recommendatory preface), afterwards by *Joh. Arnd.* 1631, by *Grell* 1817, by *Detzer*, Erl. 1827, and by †*Troxler*, St. Gallen 1837. Comp. Luther's opinion on this work in *de Wette's* collection of Luther's letters, No. 60, p. 102: " *This noble book, though simple and destitute of adornment of language and of human wisdom, is much richer and more precious in art, and that wisdom which is Divine. And to praise according to my old fashion, next to the Bible and St. Augustine, I do not know of any book from which I have learnt better, and assert that it could be learnt better what God, Christ, man, and all things are.*" Extract from Luther's Preface. *De Wette* (christl. Sittenlehre, p. 251,) calls the

work in question "*a sound and energetic treatise, full of spirit and life, written in a pure and concise style, and worthy of being so strongly recommended by Luther.*"

(10) His true name was *Thomas Hamerken* of Kempen: he was subprior of the Augustinian monks on St. Agnes' mount near Zwoll, and died A. D. 1471. "*He was rather a pious, warm-hearted, and edifying preacher, than a mystic properly speaking; at least he possessed scarcely anything of a speculative tendency.*" *de Wette*, l. c. p. 247. He was the author of several pious tracts: Soliloquia animæ, Hortulus rosarum, Vallis liliorum, de tribus tabernaculis, de solitudine, de silentio, etc. His most celebrated work (which some, however, have ascribed to other authors, *e. g.* to Abbot Gersen, or to John Gerson) is: de imitatione Christi libri iv. Opp. Norimb. 1494. Par. 1520. fol. Antw. 1607. Comp. the critical examination of its authorship by †*J. P. Silbert*, (who pronounces in favour of Thomas à Kempis), Wien. 1828. 8. *Gieseler*, l. c. ii. 4, § 146, notes l. and m. *Ch. Schmidt*, Essai sur Jean Gerson, p. 121.

(11) John Charlier Gerson, surnamed Doctor christianissimus, was chancellor of the university of Paris, and died A. D. 1429. He wrote: Considerationes de theologia mystica, de perfectione, de meditatione cordis, etc. An edition of his complete works was published at Antv. 1706, fol. Hagæ comit. 1728. Comp. *Engelhardt*, de Gersonio Mystico 1822. ***Hundeshagen*, *K. B.*** über die mystische Theologie des Joh. Charlier Gerson. Leipz. 1834, (reprinted separately from the fourth volume of the Zeitschrift für historische Theologie.) **Liebner*, *A.*, über Gersens mystische Theologie in the Studien und Kritiken, 1835, part 2. p. 277, ss. **Schmidt*, *Ch.*, Essai sur Jean Gerson, chancelier de l'université et de l'église de Paris. Strasb. et Paris, 1839. On the different definitions of the nature of mysticism. see Consideratio 28, p. 384 (*Hundeshagen*, p. 49.) That he opposed Ruysbroek was mentioned above, note 6.—Gerson perceives, "*in the sensuous imagination a powerful enemy to pure and mystical contemplation, and takes care repeatedly and very strongly to warn against its illusions.*" *Hundeshagen* p. 81.

§ 154.

SCIENTIFIC OPPOSITION MADE TO SCHOLASTICISM.

Meiners Ch., Lebensbeschreibungen berühmter Männer aus den Zeiten der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaft. Zürich, 1795. *Heeren, A. H. L.*, Geschichte der klassischen Literatur seit dem Wiederaufleben der Wissenschaft. Göttingen 1797. 1801. 8. *Erhard, H. A.*, Geschichte des Wiederaufblühens wissenschaftlicher Bildung. Magdeburg, 1827. 30. ii. vol.

Even as early as the thirteenth century *Roger Bacon* had combated the one-sided speculative tendency of scholasticism, and endeavoured to improve the method of studying theology.(1) But far more was done during the second half of the fifteenth century for the restoration of classical studies, by which the minds of men were delivered from that one-sided theological speculation in which both the scholastic and the mystical divines so freely indulged. Attention was directed to a more harmonious developement of all the powers of the soul, a more simple and rational mode of perception, and above all, to a treatment of all spiritual subjects distinguished by a better taste.(2) *Laurentius Valla*,(3) *John Reuchlin*,(4) and *Desiderius Erasmus*(5) may, generally speaking, be considered as the restorers of classical (and to some extent of Hebrew) philology. *Marsilius Ficinus*,(6) and *John Picus of Mirandola*,(7) were the principal advocates of the study of the Platonic philosophy, and thus, on the one hand, limited the excessive authority of Aristotle and the dominion of scholasticism, and, on the other, showed how mysticism might be more intimately connected with speculation.

(1) Roger Bacon, surnamed Doctor mirabilis, was a monk of the order of the Franciscans, and professor of theology in the university of Oxford from the year 1240. He wrote (A. D. 1267): Opus majus de utilitate scientiarum ad Clementem IV.

Very characteristic extracts from it are given by *Gieseler*, ii. § 74, note x.

(2) "*If we ask what forms the most obvious contrast with the scholastic philosophy and theology, as well as with the practice of the scholastic divines, we may say, that it is good common sense, experience (both outward and inward), perception of nature and humanity.*" *Hegel*, Geschichte der Philosophie iii. p. 200.

(3) He died A. D. 1457. His works were published at Basle 1540. 43.

(4) John Reuchlin, otherwise called Capnio, lived from 1455 to 1522. Comp. **Mayerhoff*, Reuchlin und seine Zeit. Berl. 1830. *Meiners* l. c. i. p. 44, ss. He furthered especially the study of the Hebrew language as well as that of the Cabbala, and gained a glorious victory over the Viri obscuri of his age.

(5) Desiderius Erasmus (Gerhard) of Rotterdam, was born A. D. 1486, and died 1536. *Adolf Müller*, Leben des Erasmus von Rotterdam. Hamb. 1828, Opp. Bas. 1540. viii. and Ludg. Bat. 1703—6. x. fol. In his Ratio perveniendi ad veram Theologiam, in the work entitled: laus stultitiæ, and elsewhere he severely criticised the extravagancies of scholasticism, and pointed out a more elegant treatment of theology. His critical edition of the New Test. (edit. princeps, published by *Froben*, Basle 1516)[a] led to a more correct study of the Bible; in his letters and various essays he endeavoured to spread the light of human knowledge. His relation to the Reformation, and to the theology of the reformers, will come before us in the next period.

(6) Respecting the controversy between the Aristotelians and Platonists, see Münscher, ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 27. Marsilius Ficinus translated the works of Plato, and wrote: de relig. christ. et fidei pietate ad Laur. Med. and de immortalitate animæ; his works were published at Paris 1641, fol. He died A. D. 1499.

(7) He was born A. D. 1463, and died 1494. He endeavoured to harmonize Plato with Aristotle. His works were published at Basle 1601, fol.; he wrote among others: in Hexaëmeron libros vii.—Quæstiones 900—de Christi regno et vanitate mundi —in Platonis Convivium libros iii.—Epistolas etc. see *Meiners* l. c. ii. from the commencement.

---

[a] The publication of the Polyglott edition of Cardinal *Ximenes*, about the rise of the German Reformation, is no less important.

155.

PRACTICAL OPPOSITION.—THE FORERUNNERS OF THE REFORMATION.

Flathe, Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation. Leipz. 1835. 8. [* *Ullmann, C.*, Reformatoren vor der Reformation, vornehmlich in Deutschland und den Niederlanden, 2 vols. Hamburg 1841. Comp. Bibliotheca Sacra, i. 1844, p. 425, ss.]

The spirit of the Reformation manifested itself more and more not only in science, but also directly in the practical life of Christians. *John de Wycliffe*,(1) *John Huss*(2) and *Jerome of Prague*, as well as their followers, partly adopted the doctrines of the mystics, partly the scholastic mode of thinking, though their tendency was on the whole more practical. Some of their followers fell into the errors of former fanatical sects.(3) The tendency of *Jerome Savonarola*(4) is altogether peculiar to himself; his theology has much of the mystical, and many events of his life would lead us to suppose that some of his views were enthusiastical, though he was on the whole a truly evangelical man. *John Wessel of Groningen*, on the contrary, united in himself the better form of mysticism, and the true spirit of scientific inquiry, which strove to throw off the fetters of scholasticism; he thus became the proper forerunner of Luther.(5)

---

(1) He was professor of theology at the university of Oxford, and combated from the year 1360 the order of the mendicant friars. Gregory XI. condemned nineteen of his theses (A. D. 1377.) His controversy respecting the doctrine of transubstantiation will come under consideration in the special history of doctrines.—His principal doctrinal work is: Dialogorum libri v. (Trialogus) Bas. 1525. ed. L. Th. Wirth. Francof. et Lips. 1753. 4. Comp. *Vaughan, R.*, life and opinions of J. de Wycliffe. Lond. 1829. ii. 2nd edit. 1831. *Webb, le Bas*, life of Wiclif. Lond. 1832.

(2) John Huss of Hussinecz, was, from the year 1402, pastor at

Prague, and suffered martyrdom A. D. 1415 at Constance. The opposition which he offered to the Pope, partook more of a practical than dogmatical nature. The views of Huss on the Lord's Supper differed less from the doctrine of the church, than those of his colleagues *Jerome of Prague* and *Jacobellus of Misa*, as will be shown in the special history of doctrines. Comp. *Neander*, kleine Gelegenheitsschriften. 3d edit. p. 214, ss.

(3) Concerning the history of the Hussites (they were also called Taborites and Callixtines) see the works on ecclesiastical history.—*Lenfant*, histoire de la guerre des Hussites. Amst. 1731, ii. 4.—*John Rokykzana* was one of their most eminent theologians.—*Martin Lokwitz* (Loquis,) a native of Moravia, belonged to the fanatical party among the Hussites; see *Schröckh*, l. c. xxxiv. p. 687.

(4) He was a monk of the order of the Dominicans, lived from the year 1489 in Florence, and suffered martyrdom A. D. 1498. —*Picus of Mirandola* composed a treatise in his defence, which is reprinted in *Goldast*, Monarchia, T. i. p. 1635.—He *wrote:* Compendio direvelazione, 1495, a Latin translation of which was published 1496.—De simplicitate vitæ christianæ.—Triumphus crucis s. de veritate fidei, 1497, and various sermons.—Comp. **Rudelbach*, Hieronymus Savonarola und seine Zeit. Hamburgh. 1835.—**Meier*, *Karl*, Girolamo Savonarola. Berl. 1836.—Concerning his *theological* opinions, see: *Ammon*, *F. W. Ph.* in Winers und Engelhardts neuem kritischem Journal, vol. viii. part 3, p. 257–82.

(5) His family name was Gansfort; he was surnamed lux mundi, magister contradictionum, lived and taught theology at Cologne, Heidelberg, Louvain, and Paris, and died A. D. 1489. "*Though a scholastic divine himself, he announced that scholasticism would soon cease to exist, asserted that Scripture is the only foundation of faith, faith the sole ground of justification without works, and urged the spiritual nature of a religious life.*" (*Meier*, Dogmengeschichte, p. 238.) His works were published at Groning. 1614.—Comp. *Muurling*, de Wesselii cum vita tum meritis in præparanda sacrorum emendatione in Belgio septentrionali. Traj. ad Rhen. 1831. *Ulmann, C.*, Johann Wessel, ein Vorgänger Luthers. Ham. 1834.

And, lastly, *John Goch* of Mechlin, who died A. D. 1475, *John of Wessel*, professor of theology at Erfurt, and afterwards minister at Worms (he died A. D. 1482) and others, as well as

Gerhard Groot, and the order of Regular Clerks must be numbered among this class of men. Comp. *Scholtz, J. G. L.*, Diss. exhibens disquisitionem, qua Thomæ a Kempis sententia de re christiana exponitur et cum Gerardi et Wesselii Gansfortii sententiis comparatur. Gron. 1840. 8.

§ 156.

THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINES AND THE HISTORY BOTH OF THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD DURING THE PRESENT PERIOD.

The present period shows as much, if not more, as any other, the intimate connection subsisting between the developement of the life of the church, and of mankind in general, and the developement of doctrine.(1) Thus a parallel may clearly be drawn between the history of scholasticism on the one hand, and that of papacy and the hierarchy on the other.(2) Monasticism and celibacy not only tended to foster the spirit of subtile speculation manifested by the schoolmen, but also awakened more ardent aspiration on the part of the mystics.(3) The splendour and magnificence of the Roman form of worship created a reacting influence upon the doctrines of the church (especially upon the doctrines of the sacraments and the saints,) in proportion as the former itself owed its existence to the latter.(4) The dogmatic mind of the present period was also symbolically displayed in the architecture of the middle ages.(5) The advantages which the West derived from the crusades, the origin of which may be partly ascribed to the religious excitement of the times, were manifold and of various description.(6) It may also be observed, that the great calamities of the fourteenth century so impressed the minds of the people, as to be at least the partial cause of the religious and mystical phenomena of those times.(7) After the exclusive use of the Latin language in all ecclesiastical matters had led to the neglect of a searching and critical examination of the Bible, and the adoption of a barbarous terminology, the spread of Grecian literature from the conquest of Constantinople (A. D. 1453) exerted a beneficial influence both upon the study of the original languages of the Sacred Scriptures, and the treatment of theological subjects.(8) And in the last place, though the terrible institution of the inquisition had for a time succeeded in intimidating the minds of the people, and in preventing the free exchange of ideas,(9) the invention of printing (about the year 1440,)(10) the discovery of America (A. D. 1490,) and the entire revolution which had taken place in the history of nations, prepared the way for a new period, which rendered a new developement of religious life necessary, as the consequence of the great changes which had happened in modes of thought and inquiry.

---

(1) Compare the general introduction.

(2) It is a somewhat important fact, that scholasticism should have commenced with the age of Gregory VII. During the dispute about the episcopal investiture *Anselm* supported the pretensions of the papal hierarchy, while shortly afterwards *Arnold of Brescia*, a disciple of Abelard, practically carried out the more liberal doctrinal principles of his master. In a similar manner *Bernard of Clairval* united dogmatic orthodoxy with a rigid adherence to papacy. Scholasticism reached its highest point of perfection about the same time that the papacy of the middle ages flourished under Pope Innocent III., and a parallel may be clearly drawn between the disruption of the schools (Thomists and Scotists,) and the papal schism which happened soon afterwards.—While the see of Rome had formerly found a support in the realistic tendency of Anselm, it now met with open opposition on the part of the nominalist Ockam. The history of mysticism may be likewise so represented, as to favour the pretensions of the Roman see in one aspect, and to oppose them in another. Papacy itself had its origin (in an ideal point of view) in a mystical perception of the world, but by its opposition to that idea, *i. e.* by its externality and worldliness, it frequently called forth opposition on the part even of the advocates of that mystical perception of the world.

(3) Certain errors of the scholastics, as well as the mystics, can scarcely be comprehended but from the monastic point of view. In earlier times the scholastic divines were monks of the order of the Benedictines, or of that of the regular canons; in later times the monks of the order of mendicant friars occupied the theological chairs (notwithstanding the opposition made by the university of Paris), and conferred degrees and preferments. We must also take into consideration the jealousy already alluded to between the different orders, which stands in intimate connection with the divisions among the scholastics.

(4) Compare the doctrine of the Saints and of the Lord's Supper in the special history of doctrines.

(5) Is it altogether accidental, that the cities of Strasburg and Cologne, which are distinguished by their cathedrals, were preeminently resorted to by mystical theologians? see *Ch. Schmidt*, Essai p. 45 and 52. There is also an evident connection between the mystical tendency and romantic poetry, (comp. *Liebner*, Hugo von St Victor, p. 246), as well as, on the one hand, between the old German school of painting and mysticism, and on the other, between Italian art and the classical tendency mentioned § 154.

(6) See *Heeren*, Entwickelung der Folgen der Kreuzzüge für Europa (historische Schriften, Göttingen 1808, vol. 2.)

(7) Comp. *Hecker*, der schwartze Tod im 14 Jahrhundert. Berlin 1832, 8.

(8) Compare § 154.

(9) See *Llorente*, Geschichte der Inquisition, Leipzig 1823.

(10) "*Religion has undoubtedly gained the powerful, healthy, and clear developement of piety, and of Christian piety in particular, by the invention of typography. The sources of Christian knowledge and education have been multiplied by it ad infinitum, and what was formerly inaccessible has been placed within the reach of all classes of society,*" etc. *Ullmann*, Rede am vierten Säcularfeste der Erfindung der Buchdruckerkunst. Heidelberg 1840, p. 20.

B. SPECIAL HISTORY OF DOCTRINES DURING THE THIRD PERIOD.

FIRST SECTION.

APOLOGETICO-DOGMATIC PROLEGOMENA.

TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY.—RELATION BETWEEN REASON AND REVELATION.—SOURCES OF REVELATION.—SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

§ 157.

TRUTH AND DIVINE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.

The ground taken by apologetical writers of the present period, in opposition to all who were not Christians, was considerably different from that which had been occupied during the first period. On the one hand, the Judaism of the middle ages was not the same with that which Justin M. combated in his dialogue with Tryphon,(1) on the other, the views of the Apologists of the middle ages on doctrinal subjects differed in many respects from those of the earlier Fathers. Other weapons were also required in the controversy with Mohammedanism than those which had been used against the ancient forms of Polytheism.(2) But the scepticism and infidelity, which made their appearance, especially towards the close of the present period, within the church itself, both in a more open, and a more concealed manner, rendered a philosophical defence of the Christian religion still more necessary, than those historical forms of religion which existed along with Christianity.(3) Generally speaking, the Apologists adopted former methods of argumentation. The arguments derived from miracles and prophecies were retained, inasmuch as tradition had sanctioned them.(4) though some writers possessed sufficient discernment to see, that the religion of Christ recommends itself by its internal excellencies, without external miracles.(5)

---

(1) Compare *e. g.* the manner in which *Agobard* upbraided the Jews of that time in his treatise de insolentia Judæorum, Opp. T. i. p. 59—66. See *Schröckh*, xxi. p. 302.

(2) Compare the writings mentioned § 144, which were directed against Mohammedanism.—The heathen, *i. e.* the heathen philosophers in particular, were combated by *Thomas Aquinas* in his: Summa catholicæ fidei contra Gentiles, Lugd. 1587, fol. which is not to be confounded with his larger work of the same name. Excerpts from it are given by *Schröckh*, xxix. p. 341, ss. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 100, ss.

(3) *Anselm* himself held the principle: Fides nostra contra impios ratione defendenda est, non contra eos, qui se Christiani nominis honore gaudere fatentur, Epp. Lib. ii. 41. On the later apologetical writings of Savonarola and Ficinus, see § 154, 155.

(4) A definition of miracle is given by *Thomas Aquinas*, p. i. quæst. 110, art. 4; Dicendum quod miraculum proprie dicitur, cum aliquid fit præter ordinem naturæ: sed non sufficit ad notionem miraculi, si aliquid fiat præter ordinem naturæ alicujus particularis, quia sic, cum aliquis projicit lapidem sursum, miraculum faceret, cum hoc sit præter ordinem naturæ lapidis. Ex hoc ergo aliquid dicitur esse miraculum, quod fit *præter ordinem totius naturæ creatæ;* hoc autem non potest facere nisi Deus, quia quidquid facit angelus vel quæcunque alia creatura propria virtute, hoc fit secundum ordinem naturæ, et sic non est miraculum. Unde relinquitur, quod solus Deus miraculum facere possit. From this objective definition of miracle, he distinguishes the subjective one: Sed quia non omnis virtus naturæ creatæ est nota nobis, ideo cum aliquid fit præter ordinem naturæ creatæ nobis notæ per virtutem creatam nobis ignotam,

est miraculum quoad nos. From the same point of view he draws a distinction between miraculum and mirum. Comp. *Baur*, Trinitätslehre, ii. p. 749, 750. †*Brischar*, der Wurderbegriff des heiligen Thomas von Aquino, in der Tübinger quartalschrift 1845, part 3. Even as late as this period Ficinus and others appealed to the Sibylline oracles. See *Schröckh*, xxxiv. p. 352.

(5) Among their number we may mention, *e. g. Æneas Sylvius*, see Platina in Vita Pii II. (towards the end.)

§ 158.

REASON AND REVELATION, FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE.

Though all Christians were convinced of the truth and Divine origin of their religion (even where they knew it only through the impure medium of the doctrine of the church), yet speculative minds were desirous of possessing a clear insight into the relation between that which has regard to mankind in general, and that which refers to Christianity alone, between revelation and reason, between the Christian religion and philosophy. *John Scotus Erigena* was the first who manifested a leaning towards Christian Rationalism, and a union between it and Supranaturalism, by considering true religion and true philosophy as one and the same thing, and by looking for the true source of religious knowledge in man himself, *i. e.* in his rational consciousness. But he did not deny the necessity of a positive revelation which has come from without.(1) *Abelard* also thought that there is such a harmony between philosophy and Christianity, that the universally acknowledged truths of reason, and the moral laws with which the heathen were acquainted, are confirmed and enlarged by the higher authority of Divine revelation.(2) According to *Anselm*, it is first of all necessary to receive by an act of faith the truths of revelation which have been sanctioned by the church, but he admitted that reason might afterwards examine the grounds of what is believed. *He*, too, proceeded on the supposition that reason and revelation cannot contradict each other.(3) *Thomas Aquinas*, endeavoured to prove that the doctrines of Christianity, on the one hand, may be apprehended by reason, but, on the other, are above reason,(4) and *Duns Scotus* pointed out the distinguishing features of revelation in short propositions.(5) The mystics also admitted (though in a manner different from that of the scholastics) the existence of an immediate consciousness; their theory was nearest allied to that of Anslem. There was, however, this difference, that some of them (viz. those who adhered to ecclesiastical orthodoxy) maintained, that the *internal* revelations were in accordance with the doctrines of the church,(6) while in the opinion of others (the fanatical mystics) the new revelations of the Spirit were sometimes openly opposed to the doctrines historically received, and even to Scripture itself.(7)

---

(1) De divina præd. ap. *Mauguin*, T. i. c. 1, § 1, (quoted by *Frommüller*, l. c. p. 50.); Quid est de Philosophia tractare, nisi veræ religionis, qua summa et principalis omnium rerum causa et humiliter colitur et rationabiliter investigatur, regulas exponere? Conficitur inde veram esse Philosophiam veram religionem conversimque veram religionem esse veram Philosophiam (comp. Augustine, de vera rel. c. 5.) He thinks that self-consciousness is the last source of religious knowledge, div. nat. v. 31, p. 268: Nulla quippe alia via est ad principalis exempli purissimam contemplationem præter proximæ sibi suæ imaginis certissimam notitiam. But he does not on that account deny the necessity of an external (positive) revelation. On the contrary, he says: ii. 31, p. 85: Nisi ipsa lux initium nobis revelaverit, nostræ ratiocinationis studium ad eam revelandam nihil proficiet (comp. § 159, ss.) Thus Scotus Erigena "*may in a certain sense be called the author of Rationalism; but his Rationalism is very different from, and forms the strongest contrast with that perverse form of Rationalism which exists at the present day.*" *Staudenmaier*, Freiburger Zeitschrift, l. c. p. 241.

(2) De Theol. christ. ii. p. 1211, (ed. *Martène*): Hinc quidem

facilius evangelica prædicatio a philosophis, quam a Judæis suscepta est, cum sibi eam maxime invenirent ad finem, nec fortasse in aliquo dissonam, nisi forte in his quæ ad incarnationis vel sacramentorum vel resurrectionis mysteria pertinent.[a] Si enim diligenter moralia evangelii præcepta consideremus, nihil ea aliud, quam reformationem legis naturæ inveniemus, quam secutos esse philosophos constat; cum lex magis figuralibus, quam moralibus nitatur mandatis et exteriori potius justitia, quam interiori abundet; evangelium vero virtutes ac vitia diligenter examinat, et secundum animi intentionem omnia, sicut et philosophi, pensat. Unde, cum tanta...*evangelicæ ac philosophicæ doctrinæ concordia* pateat, nonnulli Platonicorum......in tantam proruperunt blasphemiam, ut Dominum Jesum omnes suas sententias a Platone accepisse dicerent, quasi philosophus ipsam docuisset Sophiam.—None but he who obtains a knowledge of the Divine by means of *active* investigation, attains unto *firm* belief. After man has done his duty, Divine love assists his efforts, and grants to him that which he could not acquire by *his own* researches, etc. "*But Abelard was far from imagining that his philosophy could give a full knowledge of Divine things which should leave no scope for desire after more information.*" *Neander*, der heilige Bernhard, p. 117, ss. Abelard made a distinction between *credere, intelligere,* and *cognoscere;* on the relation in which these terms stand to each other, see *Neander*, l. c. (Abelard uses still stronger language on this point in his Introductio, than in his more modified Theologia christiana; see *Neander*, l. c. p. 127, note 4.) *Alanus ab Insulis* considered faith superior to opinio, but inferior to scientia, (Art. 17, quoted by *Pez*, i. p. 482.) Comp. the opinion of Clement of Alexandria, § 34, note 6. On the view of *St. Bernard*, which was opposed to that of Abelard ("God is found by prayer, not by discussions,") see *Neander*, der heilige Bernhard, p. 147, ss.

(3) Prosl. c. 1:......Desidero aliquatenus intelligere veritatem tuam, quam credit et amat cor meum. *Neque enim quæro intelligere, ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam. Nam et hoc credo, quia nisi credidero, non intelligam.* De incarn. verbi c. 2: Nullus quippe Christianus debet disputare, quod catholica Ecclesia corde

---

[a] From this passage it appears, that as early as the time of Abelard a distinction was made between articuli puri et mixti. Comp. also what Thomas Aquinas said, note 4.

credit et ore confitetur, quomodo non sit: sed semper eandem fidem indubitanter tenendo, amando et secundum illam vivendo humiliter, quantum potest quærere rationem, quomodo sit. Si potest intelligere, Deo gratias agat: si non potest, non immittat cornua ad ventilandum, sed submittat caput ad venerandum. Citius enim in se potest confidens humana sapientia impingendo cornua sibi evellere, quam innitendo petram hanc evellere.........Palam namque est, quia illi non habent fidei firmitatem, qui, quoniam quod credunt, intelligere non possunt, disputant contra ejusdem fidei a sanctis patribus confirmatam veritatem, velut si vespertiliones et noctuæ, non nisi in nocte cœlum videntes, de meridianis solis radiis disceptent contra aquilas, solem ipsum irreverberato visu intuentes. Prius ergo fide mundandum est cor.........prius ea quæ carnis sunt posponentes, secundum spiritum vivamus, quam profunda fidei dijudicando discutiamus.........Quanto opulentius nutrimur in Sacra Scriptura, ex his, quæ per obedientiam pascunt, tanto subtilius provehimur ad ea, quæ per intellectum satiant....*Nam qui non crediderit, non experietur, et qui expertus non fuerit non intelliget.* Nam quantum rei auditum superat experientia, tantum vincit audientis cognitionem experientis scientia.........Nemo ergo se temere mergat in condensa difficillimarum quæstionum, nisi prius in soliditate fidei conquisita morum et sapientiæ gravitate, ne per multiplicia sophismatum diverticula in tanta levitate discurrens, aliqua tenaci illaqueetur falsitate. Comp. de sacram. altaris ii. 2: Christianæ fidei veritas quasi hoc speciali jure præminet, ut non ipsa per intellectum sed per eam intellectus quærendus sit.........Qui ergo nihil credere vult, nisi ratione vel intellectu præcedente, hic rem confundit et scire omnia volens, nihil credens, fidem, quæ in ipso est, videtur annullare.—Epp. Lib. ii. 41: Christianus per fidem debet ad intellectum proficere: non per intellectum ad fidem accedere, aut si intelligere non valet, a fide recedere. Sed cum ad intellectum valet pertingere, delectatur: cum vero nequit, quod capere non potest, veneratur.—Nevertheless he asserts, that the acquisition of knowledge is a duty imperative upon him who has the power of knowing God. In his treatise entitled; Cur Deus homo i. c. 2, he represents Boso as speaking as follows (without contradicting him): Sicut rectus ordo exigit, ut profunda christianæ fidei credamus, priusquam ea præsumamus ratione discutere, *ita negligentia mihi videtur, si postquam confirmati sumus in fide, non studemus quod credimus intelligere.*

Comp. ibid. c. 10. 25. Nor does Boso declare himself satisfied respecting the doctrine of satisfaction, until he has seen the *reasonableness* of the reasons adduced; ii. 19 and 21. "*The scholastic divines did not think it an extravagant notion, that all the truths contained in the Old and New Testaments might be proved by rational speculation; but it was always presupposed, that what is matter of faith rests on its own grounds, and needs no proof: thus whatever is added by reason, however valuable in other respects, is nothing but an opus supererogationis in reference to all matter of faith.*" *Baur*, Versöhnungslehre, p. 185, note. Comp *Möhler's* Schriften, i. p. 137, 38.

(4) *Thom. Aqu.* Summ. cath. fid. contra gentiles, l. i. c. 3, (quoted by *Münscher*, edit. by von Cölln, p. 100: Est in his, quæ de Deo confitemur, duplex veritatis modus. Quædam namque vera sunt de Deo, quæ omnem facultatem humanæ rationis excedunt, ut Deum esse triunum et unum. Quædam vero sunt ad quæ etiam ratio naturalis pertingere potest: sicut est Deum esse, Deum esse unum, et alia hujusmodi: quæ etiam philosophi demonstrative de Deo probaverunt, ducti naturalis lumine rationis. —But even these points must be confirmed by revelation, otherwise the knowledge of God would be a privilege of but a few (viz. of those who think and know:) others whom levity prevented during the earlier period of their life from giving heed to these things, would not acquire a knowledge of them until it was too late. But even in the most favourable case there would be reason for apprehending, lest error should be mixed up with truth. [Cap. 5, he proves that ea quæ ratione investigari non possunt, convenienter fide tenenda proponuntur.] The truths of revelation, however, though going beyond reason, do not contradict it, etc. Comp. *Schröckh*, xxix. p. 342, ss.

(5) These features are: Prænuntiatio prophetica, Scripturarum concordia, auctoritas scribentium, diligentia recipientium, rationabilitas contentorum, irrationabilitas singulorum errorum, ecclesiæ stabilitas and miraculorum claritas, according to *Baur*, Lehrbuch, p. 174.

(6) This was the case, *e. g.* with *Hugo of St Victor*, and *Richard of St Victor*. Comp. Hugo de Sacramentis fidei l. i. p. iii. c. 30, (de cognitione divinitatis) quoted by *Liebner*, p. 173, ss. 186: Alia enim sunt *ex ratione*, alia *secundum rationem*, alia *supra rationem* et præter hæc quæ sunt *contra rationem*. Ex ratione sunt necessaria, secundum rationem sunt probabilia, supra

rationem mirabilia, contra rationem incredibilia. Et duo quidem extrema omnino *fidem* non capiunt. Quæ enim sunt ex ratione omnino nota sunt et *credi* non possunt, quoniam *sciuntur*. Quæ vero contra rationem sunt, nulla similiter ratione credi possunt, quoniam non suscipiunt ullam rationem, nec acquiescit his ratio aliqua. Ergo quæ secundum rationem sunt et quæ sunt supra rationem, tantummodo suscipiunt fidem. Et in primo quidem genere fides ratione adjuvatur et ratio fide perficitur, quoniam secundum rationem sunt, quæ creduntur. Quorum veritatem si ratio non comprehendit, fidei tamen illorum non contradicit. In iis, quæ supra rationem sunt, non adjuvatur fides ratione ulla, quoniam non capit ea ratio, quæ fides credit, et tamen est aliquid, quo ratio admonetur venerari fidem, quam non comprehendit. Quæ dicta sunt ergo secundum rationem, probabilia fuerunt rationi et sponte acquievit eis. Quæ vero supra rationem fuerunt, ex divina revelatione prodita sunt, et non operata est in eis ratio, sed castigata tamen, ne ad illa contenderet.—The theory of *Richard of St Victor* is somewhat more complicated. But he too believed "*that Divine Revelation and human reason agree in bearing testimony to the one truth.*" *Engelhardt*, Richard von St. Victor, p. 66. Concerning the relation in which contemplation stands to meditation, as well as respecting the six different kinds of the former, see Engelhardt, l. c. p. 60, ss. *John of Salisbury*, on the contrary, taught that the endeavours of man after knowledge must be aided by God himself, Policrat. Lib. vii. c. 14. (Bibl. max. T. xxiii. p. 352): Quisquis ergo viam philosophandi ingreditur, ad ostium gratiæ ejus humiliter pulset, in cujus manu liber omnium sciendorum est, quem solus aperit agnus, qui occisus est, ut ad viam sapientiæ et veræ felicitatis servum reduceret aberrantem. Frustra quis sibi de capacitate ingenii, de memoriæ tenacitate, de assiduitate studii, de linguæ volubilitate blanditur....Est autem humilitati conjuncta simplicitas, qua discentium intelligentia plurimum adjuvatur. *Savonarola* appeals to the internal testimony, Triumph. crucis procem. quoted by *Rudelbach*, p. 376: Licet fides ex causis principiisque naturalibus demonstrari non possit, ex manifestis tamen effectibus validissimas rationes adducemus, quas nemo sanæ mentis inficiari poterit.

(7) Comp. § 161, note 5.

§ 159.

SOURCES OF KNOWLEDGE.—BIBLE AND TRADITION.

Though the Bible was still theoretically regarded as the highest authority in all religious matters,(1) yet it was gradually overshadowed by tradition, which was deemed of equal importance with Scripture.(2) Its doctrines were more and more corrupted and mixed up with the arbitrary traditions of men. In addition to the tradition of the church, the book of nature was held in reverence together with the written Word of God.(3) Some of the mystical sects looked upon other writings beside the Bible as Divine gifts,(4) and even went so far as to honour their own imaginations as the oracles of God.(5)

(1) Joh. Dam. de fide orth. i. 1: Πάντα τοίνυν τὰ παραδεδομένα ἡμῖν διά τε νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καί ἀποστόλων καὶ εὐαγγελιστῶν δεχόμεθα καὶ γινώσκομεν καὶ σέβομεν, οὐδὲν περαιτέρω τούτων ἐπιζητοῦντες......... Ταῦτα ἡμεῖς στέρξωμεν καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς μείνωμεν, μὴ μεταίροντες ὅρια αἰώνια, μηδὲ ὑπερβαίνοντες τὴν θείαν παράδοσιν. Comp. iv. 17. *Joh. Scot. Erig.* de div. nat. i. c. 66, p. 37: Sanctæ siquidem Scripturæ in omnibus sequenda est auctoritas, quum in ea veluti quibusdam suis secretis sedibus veritas; (he makes, however, the following limitation): non tamen ita credendum est, ut ipsa semper propriis verborum seu nominum signis fruatur, divinam nobis naturam insinuans; sed quibusdam similitudinibus variisque translatorum verborum seu nominum modis utitur, infirmitati nostræ condescendens nostrosque adhuc rudes infantilesque sensus simplici doctrina erigens. Nor can Scripture contradict reason, c. 68, p. 38: Nulla itaque auctoritas te terreat ab his, quæ rectæ contemplationis rationabilis suasio edocet. Vera enim auctoritas rectæ rationi non obsistit, neque recta ratio veræ auctoritati. Ambo siquidem ex uno fonte, divina videlicet sapientia manere, dubium non est. Comp. c. 69, p. 39.—*John of Salisbury*, on the contrary, used much more unqualified language, Policrat. l. c. (§ 158, note 5): Serviendum est ergo scripturis, non dominandum. Nisi forte quis se ipsum dignum credat, ut angelis debeat dominari.

(2) *Joh. Dam.* de fide orth. [iv. 12 : Αὐτὸν (Χριστὸν) οὖν ἐκδεχόμενοι ἐπὶ ἀνατολὰς προσκυνοῦμεν· ἄγραφος δε ἐστιν ἡ παράδοσις αὕτη τῶν Ἀποστόλων· πολλὰ γὰρ ἀγράφως ἡμῖν παρέδοσαν] Cap. 16 : Ὅτι δὲ καὶ πλεῖστα οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀγράφως παραδεδώκασι, γράφει Παῦλος ὁ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος (2 Thess. ii. 15. 1 Cor. xi. 2.) De imaginibus Orat. i. 23. (Opp. i. p. 318) : Οὐ μόνον γράμμασι τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν θεσμοθεσίαν παρέδωκαν (οἱ πατέρες), ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγράφοις τισὶ παραδόσεσι......Πόθεν τὸ τρὶς βαπτίζειν; πόθεν τὸ κατ' ἀνατολὰς εὔχεσθαι ; πόθεν ἡ τῶν μυστηρίων παράδοσις, κ. τ. λ. Comp. Orat. ii. 16, p. 338. *John Scotus Erigena*, by drawing a parallel between Scripture and reason, seems to subordinate tradition to both of them (and especially to reason) i. c. 71, p. 39 : Omnis autem auctoritas, quæ vera ratione non approbatur, infirma videtur esse. Vera autem ratio, quum virtutibus suis rata atque immutabilis munitur, nullius auctoritatis adstipulatione roborari indiget. Nil enim aliud videtur mihi esse vera auctoritas, nisi rationis virtute cooperta veritas et a *sacris patribus* ad posteritatis utilitatem litteris commendata...... Ideoque *prius* ratione utendum est.........ac deinde auctoritate ....ibid. iv. 9 : Non sanctorum patrum sententiæ, præsertim si plurimis notæ sunt, introducendæ sunt, nisi ubi summa necessitas roborandæ ratiocinationis exegerit propter eos, qui cum sint rationis inscii, plus auctoritati quam rationi succumbunt.—Erigena, however, was almost alone in his views. Most writers adopted the definitions propounded by Augustine and Vincentius Lerinensis during the preceding period (comp. § 122.) Thus *Alcuin* admonished to adhere to the doctrine generally received, to abstain from the use of new terms, etc. (in Ep. ad Felic. Opp. i. p. 783, comp. p. 791, ss.) : Porro nos intra terminos apostolicæ doctrinæ et sanctæ *romanæ* ecclesiæ firmiter, stamus : illorum probatissimam sequentes auctoritatem, et sanctissimis inhærentes doctrinis, nihil novi inferentes, nullaque recipientes, nisi quæ in illorum catholicis inveniuntur scriptis. *Abelard*, on the other hand, by his work : *Sic et non*, undermined the authority of the earlier Fathers, and consequently that of tradition. The authority of Aristotle was added in later times to that of the church, till the authority of Scripture was again prominently brought forward as the highest and only true one in the age immediately preceding the Reformation (thus by *Wycliffe.*) [*Vaughan*, Life of Wycliffe, ii. 312, 13.]

(3) *John Scotus Erigena* maintains that every creature is a theophany of God, de div. nat. iii. 19. According to the Theol.

naturalis of *Raymund of Sabunde*, God has granted to men *two* different books, viz. the book of nature, and the book of revelation; they neither can, nor must contradict each other; *the latter, however, is not accessible to all, but only to the priests.* All knowledge must commence with the former, which is equally within the reach of the laity; every creature is a character written by God himself. But the highest knowledge is the love of God as the only thing which man can offer to the Deity of his own. Comp. *Hase*, Kirchengeschichte, § 287. *Tennemann*, viii. p. 964, ss.—In a similar manner *St Bernard* asserted, that what he was able to accomplish in the way of interpreting Scripture, and what he understood of Divine things, he had acquired by contemplation and prayer, especially in forests and fields, and that he had had no other teacher than beeches and oaks; see *Neander*, der heilige Bernhard, p. 6. Comp. *Bruder Berthold's* Predigten, edited by Kling, p. 113. where the same notion of two books (heaven and earth) occurs.[a]

(4) Thus the Spirituales in particular attached great importance to the Evangelium æternum (prophecies of *Joachim*, abbot of Flore in Calabria, who died A. D. 1202.) On the said work comp. *Engelhardt*, Kirchenhistorische Abhandlungen, Erl. 1832, No. 1. Extracts from it are given by *d'Argentrée*, Coll. judiciorum de novis error. Paris, 1728, T. i. p. 163, ss.

(5) Some writers went so far as to make the most daring assertions; thus *David of Dinanto* maintained, that God had made communications by Ovid no less than by Augustine, *Engelhardt*, l. c. p. 255. The Beguines taught, quod homo magis tenetur sequi instinctum interiorem, quam veritatem evangelii, quod quotidie prædicatur; see the epistle of *John*, bishop of Strasburg, in *Mosheim*, l. c. p. 258. Comp. § 161.

---

[a] It is worthy of observation that Scripture is much more firmly established than tradition, which undergoes more or less frequent changes, and is sometimes substituted by something else, as in the above case, by nature; John Scotus Erigena introduced reason in the room of tradition, and the mystics did the same with regard to internal revelation.

§ 160.

THE CANON OF THE BIBLE AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

In accordance with what had been decided in the preceding period respecting the Canon of the Bible, the Latin church generally regarded the books commonly called the Apocrypha of the Old Testament as a part of it.(1) The *Paulicians* in the East rejected (like the Gnostics) the Old Test. and the writings of Peter.(2) But as late as the age of the Carlovingians doubts were entertained even within the pale of the catholic church itself respecting the genuineness of various parts of the Old Testament.(3)

---

(1) Comp. the Canon of *Isidorus Hispalensis* de eccles. off. i. c. 12. quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 106, and the decisions of synods on this point. See also *John Damasc.* iv. 17, [he adopts the Canon of the council of Laodicea, and mentions some apocryphal books (ἡ Πανάρετος, τουτέστιν ἡ Σοφία τοῦ Σαλαμῶντος, καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ), respecting which he remarks: ἐνάρετοι μὲν καὶ παλαὶ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀριθμοῦνται, οὐδε ἔκειντο ἐν τῇ κιβωτῷ.]. Concerning the apocryphal writings some western theologians, such as *Odo of Clugny*, *Hugo of St Victor*, *John of Salisbury*, *Hugo of St Caro*, and others, appealed to Jerome, but the Canon of Augustine was more generally adopted. See *Münscher*, l. c. p. 107, and *Liebner*, Hugo von St. Victor, p. 129.

(2) According to Petrus Siculus, quoted by *Wettstein*, Nov. Test. ii p. 681, *de Wette*, Einleitung ins Neue Test. p. 281.

(3) "*The monks of the monastery of St. Gallen ventured to point out what they thought unworthy of God in the Canon of the Sacred Scriptures. Concerning the books of Chronicles and Esther, their opinion was: in eis littera non pro auctoritate, tantum pro memoria tenetur. They judged in like manner of the book of Judith, and of the Maccabees.*" *Johannes von Müller*, Geschichte der Schweizerischen Eidgenossen, Book. i. ch. 12, p. 287, according to *Notker*, de interpretat. S.S. ad Salomonem in Pez, thes. anecd. T. i.

§ 161.

INSPIRATION.

Generally speaking, the notions hitherto entertained respecting inspiration continued to prevail in the church.(1) The assertion of *Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons,* that the sacred penmen had not always adhered to the rules of the grammar, called forth decided opposition on the part of *Fredegis, abbot of Tours,* against which Agobard defended himself with good common sense.(2) *Euthymius Zigabenus* met with less opposition on the part of the Greek church, though he did not hesitate to give his opinion respecting the discrepancies respecting the different evangelists.(3) The scholastic divines endeavoured to define more precisely the idea of inspiration,(4) while the mystics more or less confounded the idea of the inspiration of Holy Writ with that of Divine inspiration in general.(5) On the whole, it ought to be borne in mind, that the theologians of the present period, whose tendency was of a poetic nature, continued to believe in the power of Divine inspiration (which they extended beyond the Canon of the Bible), and were far from restricting the fulness of the manifestations of the Divine Spirit within the narrow limits of a single book, however much importance might be attached to its Divine origin.(6)

---

(1) Joh. Dam. de fide orth. iv. c. 17. (Opp. i. p. 282): Διὰ πνεύματος τοίνυν ἁγίου ὅ τε νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται, εὐαγγελισταὶ καὶ ἀπόστολοι καὶ ποιμένες ἐλάλησαν καὶ διδάσκαλοι. Πᾶσα τοίνυν γραφὴ θεόπνευστος πάντως καὶ ὠφέλιμος κ. τ. λ. (2 Tim. iii. 16.)

(2) Agobard ad Fredegisium Abbatem, (Opp. Par. p. 157, ss.) Abbot *Fredegis* would have extended infallibility even to translators and commentators. Concerning the sacred penmen themselves, Fredegis asserted: Turpe est credere Spir. Sanctum, qui omnium gentium linguas mentibus Apostolorum infudit, *rusticitatem* potius per eos, quam *nobilitatem* uniuscujusque

linguæ locutum esse; hence he further maintained: Ut non solum sensum prædicationis et modos vel argumenta dictionum Spir. S. eis inspiraverit, sed etiam ipsa corporalia verba extrinsecus in ora illorum ipse formaverit. *Agobard* replied as follows: Quod si ita sentitis, quanta absurditas sequetur, quis dinumerare poterit?.........Restat ergo ut sicut ministerio angelico vox articulata formata est in ore asinæ, ita dicatis formari in ore Prophetarum, et tunc talis etiam absurditas sequetur, ut si tali modo verba et voces verborum acceperunt, sensum ignorarent; sed absit *talia deliramenta cogitare*. He quoted several instances from Scripture relative to differences of style, and to confessions on the part of writers themselves, *e. g.* Exod. iv. and 1 Cor. i.—Laus divinæ sapientiæ (he continued) in sacris mysteriis et in doctrina spiritus invenitur, non in inventionibus verborum.........Vos sic laudatis, ut laude vestra magis minoretur, quam augeatur (divina majestas), quoniam in his, quæ extrinsecus sunt, dicitis nobilitatem linguarum ministrasse Apostolis Spiritum Sanctum, ut confuse et indifferenter cum Apostolis omnes interpretes et quoscunque expositores laudetis et defendatis. "*Near as Agobard was to drawing a precise distinction between the Divine and that which is peculiarly human in the idea of inspiration,*" yet he was far from "*fully developing it.*" *Neander*, Kirchengeschichte iv. p. 388. (Thus Agobard supposed, p. 164, that the sacred penmen *could* have written better if they *would* have done so, but that they *accommodated* themselves to human infirmities.) On the other hand, it cannot be inferred from the assertion of Fredegis that he would have reason entirely submit to the authority of Scripture. He thought that reason was confirmed and protected by the authority of the bible. Comp. *Ritter* vii. p. 189.

(3) Comment. in Evang. Matth. c. xii. 8, (T. i. p. 465, ed. Matthiæ.) Comp. *Schröckh*, Kirchengesch. xxviii. p. 310. That one evangelist sometimes relates what is omitted by another, etc., he simply attributes to the circumstance, that they did not very exactly recollect all the events of the life of Christ, because it was not till a considerable space of time had elapsed that they composed their narratives.

(4) "*However much the scholastic divines have done in the developement of all the other ideas which determine the sphere of revelation, and however much we owe to them, especially as regards the fact that they defined the objective idea of a miracle,*

their definitions concerning this point (*the doctrine of inspiration*) *are very scanty. This point was assumed as an* ἀρχὴ πρώτη *which needed no further proof, inasmuch as the whole Christian church moved in this element.*" *Rudelbach,* die Lehre von der Inspiration der heiligen Schrift (comp. § 32,) p. 48, 49. We find, however, more precise definitions in the writings of the principal scholastic divines, *Thomas Aquinas* and *Duns Scotus.*[a] The former treats of the subject in question in his Summa theolog. Pars. i. qu. 1. art. 9, 10, the latter in his Prol. Sententt. qu. 2, quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, l. c. p. 103—5.

(5) On this point too the opinions were different. The more considerate mystics, such as the disciples of the school of St Victor, adhered closely to the Sacred Scriptures, and ascribed inspiration to them in a peculiar sense. Comp. *Liebner*, Hugo von St Victor, p. 128, ss. (little is there said respecting the idea of inspiration itself, but the inspiration of the Scriptures is everywhere presupposed.) Hugo supposed that in some instances the sacred penmen had drawn from their own resources, *e. g.* the author of Ecclesiastes, see *Liebner* p. 160; but in other places he distinguished between the Divine and that which is peculiarly human. Thus he observed concerning Obadiah, that he combined profound ideas with a plain style, and was sparing in words, but rich in thoughts, ibid. p. 163.—*Savonarola,* whose opinions were allied to these of the mystics, also believed that the Sacred Scriptures are strictly speaking inspired by God; but he proceeded on the principle (as Clement of Alexandria and Chrysostom had done before him, comp. § 32, note 8, and § 119, note 4), that the gospels were originally written not so much on tables of stone, or sheets of paper, as into hearts of flesh by means of the finger and power of the Holy Ghost. He admitted at the same time that limitation according to which God did not use the sacred writers as instruments which have no will of their own, but suffered women to talk as women, and shepherds as shepherds, etc. see *Rudelbach,* Savonarola, p. 335, 36. Savonarola however did not limit inspiration to the Sacred Scriptures, inasmuch as it is well known that he ascribed pro-

---

[a] Similar definitions were set forth concerning the prophets of the Old Test. by the rabbins of the middle ages, Moses Maimonides and others, see *Rudelbach* l. c. p. 50, ss. And how much attention some of the schoolmen must have given to the subject in question, may be seen from the circumstance that *Anselm* spent *whole nights* in meditating on it, see *Möhler*, l. c. p. 52.

phetic gifts to *himself*, though without making any boast of them. Concerning this prophetic gift, as well as that claimed by *Joachim* and *Brigitta*, see Rudelbach l. c. p. 297, ss.; the views of Savonarola himself on this subject are given ibid. p. 303. (they are taken from the Compendium revelationum)—The fanatic mystics, on the contrary, maintained, in opposition to Scripture, that being filled with the Holy Spirit, they were above the law, see *Mosheim*, de Beguinis p. 216, or openly taught: multa in Evangeliis esse poëtica, quæ non sunt vera, sicut est illud: Venite, benedicti etc. Item, quod magis homines debent credere humanis conceptibus, qui procedunt ex corde, quam doctrinæ evangelicæ. Item, aliquos ex eis posse meliores libros reparare *omnibus* libris catholicæ fidei etc. quoted by *Mosheim* l. c. p. 258.—Comp. § 159.

(6) *Thomas Aquinas* says, P. I. Qu. xii. art 13, (the passage refers properly speaking to the visions recorded in Scripture, but admits of a more general application): Lumen naturale intellectus confortatur per infusionem luminis gratuiti et interdum etiam phantasmata in imaginatione hominis formantur divinitus, magis experimentia res divinas, quam ea, quæ naturaliter a sensibilibus accipimus. "*Such an extraordinary and direct inspiration was formerly ascribed to Thomas, Scotus, and other theologians, when the accounts of frequent appearances and visits on the part of God, as well as other blessed and holy beings were generally believed.*" *Semler*, introduction to Baumgerten ii. p. 63.—It was the opinion of the mystics that higher divine inspiration was still vouchsafed to the pious. *Gerson*, Consid X.: Intelligentia simplex est vis animæ cognitiva, *suspiciens immediate a Deo* naturalem quandam lucem, in qua et per quam principia prima cognoscuntur esse vera et certissima terminis apprehensis (quoted by *Liebner*, Hugo von St Victor, p. 340, where further details are given respecting the mystical doctrine of revelation as held by Hugo and Richard of St Victor.) The reader may compare with this opinion the views of *Tauler* (Predigten i. p. 124), who made a distinction between *active* and *passive* reason. The latter must act upon the former; but it receives its own revelations from God. In accordance with earlier notions inspiration was extended even to worldly subjects, *e. g.* to poetry. Thus it is said in the biography of St Elizabeth concerning the singers on the Wartburg: "they contended against each other with songs, and enriched their songs with

pretty mysteries which they had borrowed from Holy writ, without being very learned men: *for God had revealed it to them;*" see *Koberstein,* über das Gedicht vom Wartburgkriege. Naumburg 1823. 4. Append. p. 65. Comp. also Konrad von Würzburg's Trojanerkrieg in *Wackernagels* Lesebuch i. col. 706.

§ 162.

INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.—EXTENT OF THE PERUSAL OF THE BIBLE.

[*Davidson,* Sacred Hermeutics, p. 163—192.]

A sound interpretation which rests on a grammatico-historical basis, was scarcely known in consequence of the neglect of philological studies, and it was not until the close of this period, that a new light began to dawn. Scripture was interpreted either in close and slavish accordance with the dictates of the church and tradition, or in an arbitrary and allegorical manner; the former was the system adopted by the advocates of subtile scholasticism, the latter that of speculative mystics.(1) *John Scotus Erigena* taught an infinite sense of Scripture,(2) others adopted Origen's notions of a threefold, or Augustine's idea of a fourfold sense of Scripture, while some even went so far as to speak of a sevenfold or eightfold sense.(3) Principles of interpretation, however, were not altogether overlooked; some of them were practically useful.(4) The rulers of the church endeavoured (from fear of heresy) to restrict the perusal of the Bible on the part of the people,(5) while private individuals were anxious to recommend it.(6) Sound scriptural views and biblical interpretation are found in the writings of *John Wessel,* "*the characteristic feature of whose theology is a biblical tendency.*"(7)

(1) See *Liebner* Hugo of St Victor, p. 132, 133: "*They [the commentators of the present period] would either rest satisfied with collecting the interpretations of the Fathers according to the*

popular notion of a threefold sense of Scripture; or they would pursue an independent course of exegesis, so as to dispense with all investigations of a philosophical and antiquarian character, further to develope the said notion of a threefold sense, and to indulge freely in those speculations to which a right or wrong apprehension of the Latin version of the Sacred Scriptures would accidentally give rise. The former method was almost exclusively adopted till the eleventh century. But it being found to be unsatisfactory, when from the middle of that century a new spiritual life began to manifest itself, and both mysticism and schclasticism were flourishing, the other method was resorted to. This new kind of mystico-dialectic exegesis......seems to have been principally developed, though not first introduced, and brought into general use by Rupert of Duytz, (he died A. D. 1135.) *A wide and fertile field was thus opened for mystical and subtile investigations. Both the mystics and scholastics, though each in his own way, brought now all their contemplations and speculations into Scripture, and carried this often so far as to leave scarcely any traces of the simple meaning of holy writ."*

(2) De div. nat. iii. 24, p. 132, [134]: Infinitus conditor Sacræ Scripturæ in mentibus prophetarum, Spiritus Sanctus, infinitos in ea constituit intellectus, ideoque nullius expositoris sensus sensum alterius aufert, dummodo sanæ fidei catholicæque professioni conveniat, quod quisque dicat, sive aliunde accipiens, sive a se ipso illuminatus, tamen a Deo inveniens. Comp. iii. 26. iv. 5, p. 164. He compares the Sacred Scriptures to a peacock's feather, the smallest particle of which glitters in various colours. Comp. *Ritter*, vii. p. 213. How very anxious he was to penetrate the hidden meaning of Scripture, may be seen from the following passage, v. 37. p. 307: O Domine Jesu, nullum aliud præmium, nullum aliam beatitudinem, nullum aliud gaudium a te postulo, nisi ut purum absque ullo errore fallacis theoriæ verba tua, quæ per tuum Sanctum Spiritum inspirita sunt, intelligam.

(3) Thus *Paschasius Radbert* taught a threefold sense of Scripture, viz. 1. The literal (historical) sense; 2. The spiritual and mystical (that which refers to the church); and, 3. The moral (relative to the soul of every individual Christian.) *Rabanus Maurus* spoke of a fourfold sense: 1. History; 2. Allegory; 3. Tropology; 4. Anagogy. [*Davidson*, l. c. p. 165, 66.] *Hugo of St. Victor* (see *Liebner*, l. c. p. 133, ss,) and *Savonarola*

(see *Rudelbach*, p. 342,) did the same. [*Davidson*, l. c. p. 173: History relates what is done; allegory teaches what is to be understood; anagogy what is to be sought; tropology what is to be done.] *Angelom*, a monk at Luxeuil, held the notion of a sevenfold sense: 1. The historical; 2. The allegorical; 3. The intermediate sense which lies between the two preceding ones; 4. The tropical (that referring to the Trinity); 5. The parabolical; 6. That sense which has regard to the two natures of Christ; and, 7. The moral: see *Pez*, thesaurus, Tom. i. and *Schmid*, Mysticismus des Mittelalters, p. 76. Concerning the eightfold sense, see *Marrier* on Odonis Cluniacensis moralia in Iobum (Bibl. Max. Patr. T. xvii. p. 315): 1. Sensus literalis vel historicus; 2. Allegoricus vel parabolicus; 3. Tropologicus vel etymologicus; 4. Anagogicus vel analogicus; 5. Typicus vel exemplaris; 6. Anaphoricus vel proportionalis; 7. Mysticus vel apocalypticus; 8. boarcademicus vel primordialis (*i. e.* quo ipsa principia rerum comparantur cum beatitudine æterna et tota dispensatione salutis, veluti loquendo de regno Dei, quod omnia sint ad Deum ipsum, unde manarunt, reditura.) The threefold sense of Scripture was itself mystically interpreted, *e. g.* by *St. Bernard* (Sermo 92, de diversis.) The bridegroom conducts the bride, 1. Into the garden: the historical sense; 2. Into the different cellars for spices, fruit, and wine: the moral sense; 3. Into the cubiculum: the mystical sense. And *Hildebert of Mans* compared the fourfold sense of Scripture to the four legs of the table of the Lord (Sermo ii. in fest. assumtionis Mariæ.) See *Lentz*, Geschichte der Homiletik, i. p. 275.

(4) Thus *Hugo of St. Victor* cautioned against indulging in allegorical interpretation, and asserted the equally great importance of literal interpretation, prænott. c. 5, quoted by *Liebner*, p. 142. [Cum igitur mystica intelligentia nonnisi ex his, quæ primo loco litera proponit, colligatur: miror qua fronte quidam allegoriarum se doctores jactitent, qui ipsam adhuc primam literæ significationem ignorant. Nos, inquiunt, scripturam legimus, sed non legimus literam. Non curamus de litera, sed allegoriam docemus. Quomodo ergo scripturam legitis, et literam non legitis? *Si enim litera tollitur, scriptura quid est?*" —"Noli itaque de intelligentia scripturarum gloriari, quamdiu literam ignoras."—"Noli igitur in verbo dei despicere humilitatem, quia per humilitatem illuminaris ad divinitatem. Quasi lutum tibi videtur totum hoc; et ideo fortasse pedibus conculcas.

Sed audi: luto isto cœci oculi ad videndum illuminantur."] But his own expositions are sometimes fanciful and trifling, as may be seen from the example given by *Liebner*, p. 163. [Opp. T. i. fol. 151, col. 4, ad Obadiah, vers. 18: In the house of Jacob the fire of human repentance burns, in the house of Joseph the flame of wisdom shines, in the house of Esau all is full of the stubble of malice. But conscience (by which he means Jacob) consumes the stubble of vice, destroys the hay of crime, burns to ashes the wood of sin, and now the wholesome fire of repentance is burning which expels the malice of Esau, and destroys the pernicious cares of the world. After this the flame of heavenly love is kindled in the soul, the sun of righteousness shines into it, it turns to its bridegroom in the uninterrupted desire of love, and fixes the spiritual eyes of the purest heart upon his beauty; it (the soul) is animated (lit. kindled) by the increase of virtues, the conflict of heavenly affections, the longing after heavenly embraces, the hope of coming into contact with the Divine, the sweet smell of kisses, and the thirst caused by transcendent desires, and the flame of Divine wisdom (Joseph) shines in it. But this state produces the fruits of innocence, the jewels of grace, and the flowers of glorious works by which the inordinate will, viz. Esau, is consumed, and the temptations of vanity are resisted.] *Thomas Aquinas* laid down the following principle (Summa, P. i. Qu. 102, art. 1.): In omnibus, quæ S. Scriptura tradit, pro fundamento tenenda veritas historica et desuper spirituales expositiones fabricandæ.—According to *Savonarola* the first condition of a productive system of interpretation is to be filled with the same spirit in which the sacred books are written, *i. e.* the spirit of faith, etc. See *Rudelbach*, p. 339, ss.

(5) See the prohibitions of Pope Innocent III. (A. D. 1199), of the Concil. Tolosanum (A. D. 1229), Canon the 14th: Prohibemus etiam ne libros Veteris Test. aut Novi laici permittantur habere: nisi forte Psalterium, vel Breviarium pro divinis officiis, aut horas B. Mariæ aliquis ex devotione habere velit. Sed ne præmissos libros habeant in vulgari translatos, auctissime inhibemus. Conc. Tarragonense (A. D. 1234), Can. 2: Item statuimus ne aliquis libros Veteris vel Novi Test. in Romania habeat. Et si aliquis habeat, infra octo dies post publicationem hujusmodi constitutionis a tempore sententiæ tradat eos loci Episcopo *comburendos:* quod nisi fecerit, sive clericus fuerit, sive laicus, tanquam suspectus de hæresi, quousque se purgaverit,

habeatur. See also the works of Ussher, Wharton, Hegelmaier, and Onymus, which are mentioned by *Münscher* von Cölln, ii. 109.

(6) Thus *John Damascenus* iv. 17, recommended the perusal of the Sacred Scriptures, though in a rather fanciful manner. He called them τὸν κάλλιστον παράδεισον, τόν εὐώδη, τὸν γλυκύτατον, τὸν ὡραιότατον, τὸν παντοίοις τῶν νοερῶν θεοφόρων ὀρνέων κελαδήμασι περιηχοῦντα ἡμῶν τὰ ὦτα κ. τ. λ. *Anselm* also strongly recommended the perusal of the Bible in his Tractatus asceticus, quoted by *Möhler*, l. c. p. 62. *Bonaventura* (Principium in libros sacros) did the same. Comp. *Lentz*, Geschichte der Homiletik i. p. 290. Concerning the Biblia Pauperum of Bonaventura, see ibid. l. c. Respecting the effects produced by the perusal of the Scriptures upon the Waldenses, see the account given by Rainerius in the thirteenth century, in the Bibl. Patr. Lugd. T. xxv., quoted by *Neander*, kleine Gelegenheitsschriften, p. 162; concerning the efforts of the friars of common life for the spread of biblical knowledge among the people, see *Neander*, l. c. p. 182 note.—*Gerhard Zerbolt*, a priest, who was a member of the association of pious Christians at Deventer, composed a treatise: de utilitate lectionis sacrarum litterarum in lingua vulgari: see Jacobi Revii Daventria illustrata, p. 41. Extracts from it are given by *Neander*, l. c.

(7) *Ullmann*, Johann Wessel, p. 190, ss.

SECOND SECTION.

THEOLOGY

(INCLUSIVE OF COSMOLOGY, ANGELOLOGY, DEMONOLOGY, ETC.)

§ 163.

THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

THE proofs of the existence of God have their proper origin in the scholastic philosophy. That which formerly was but the semblance of an argument, now appeared in the form of a philosophical demonstration. Thus the *cosmological proof* of Diodorus of Tarsus was fully developed by *John Damascenus,*(1) the *ontological proof* of Augustine and Boëthius was established with philosophical precision by *Anselm of Canterbury.*(2) *Gaunilo,* a monk, resting on a kind of empirical and popular philosophy, raised objections of a somewhat futile nature to the proof of Anselm, which were ingeniously refuted by the latter.(3) The fate which the said proof met with, was various.(4) While *Hugo of St. Victor* endeavoured to prove the existence of God in a different way, viz. from contingency,(5) the theologians of the thirteenth century in general, and *Thomas Aquinas* in particular, returned to the argument of Anselm, though they modified it in various ways.(6) *Raimund of Sabunde* propounded what is called the *moral* proof, according to which the existence of an eternal author of reward and punishment is inferred from the moral freedom and accountability of rational creatures.(7) And, lastly, we may mention the *historical* proof of *Savonarola*,(8) and others, who endeavoured to demonstrate the existence of God from the consensus gentium.—There were, however, those who showed the unsatisfactory nature of the said arguments, or at least abstained from the use of all proofs of such a nature, and simply appealed to the direct manifestations of God in the heart of man. *John Duns Scotus*(9) and *William Ockam*(10) belonged to the former, *John Wessel*,(11) and most of all the mystics, belonged to the latter class of theologians.(12)

(1) De fide orthod. i. 3. John Damascenus proceeds from the principle: Ἡ γνῶσις τοῦ εἶναι θεὸν φυσικῶς ἡμῖν ἐγκατέσπαρται—but this consciousness of God was impaired by sin. God restored it by his revelation which was accompanied by miracles. The feeble endeavours of establishing proofs of the existence of God now come in the room of miracles. He enumerates the following proofs: The proof ex rerum mutabilitate (the cosmological); 2. The proof ex earum conservatione, et gubernatione, and 3. Ex rerum ordinato situ (the last two may be comprehended under the designation physico-theological proof.) As for the first, he argues as follows: Πάντα τὰ ὄντα ἢ κτιστά ἐστιν, ἢ ἄκτιστα· εἰ μὲν οὖν κτιστὰ, πάντως καὶ τρεπτά· ᾧ γὰρ τὸ εἶναι ἀπὸ τροπῆς ἤρξατο, ταῦτα τῇ τροπῇ ὑποκείσεται πάντως, ἢ φθειρόμενα, ἢ κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἀλλοιούμενα· εἰ δὲ ἄκτιστα, κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀκολουθίας λόγον, πάντως καὶ ἄτρεπτα· ὧν γὰρ τὸ εἶναι ἐναντίον, τούτων καὶ ὁ τοῦ πῶς εἶναι λόγος ἐναντίος, ἤγουν αἱ ἰδιότητες: Τίς οὖν οὐ συνθήσεται, πάντα τὰ ὄντα, ὅσα ὑπὸ τὴν ἡμετέραν αἴσθησιν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἀγγέλους τρέπεσθαι καὶ ἀλλοιοῦσθαι καὶ πολυτρόπως κινεῖσθαι; . . . . . Τρεπτὰ τοίνυν ὄντα, πάντως καὶ κτιστά· κτιστὰ δὲ ὄντα, πάντως ὑπό τινος ἐδημιουργήθησαν. δεῖ δὲ τὸν δημιουργὸν ἄκτιστον εἶναι. Εἰ γὰρ κἀκεῖνος ἐκτίσθη, πάντως ὑπό τινος ἐκτίσθη, ἕως ἂν ἔλθωμεν εἴς τι ἄκτιστον. Ἄκτιστος οὖν ὢν ὁ δημιουργὸς, πάντως καὶ ἄτρεπτός ἐστι. Τοῦτο δὲ τί ἂν ἄλλο εἴη, ἢ θεός; Comp. the method adopted by Diodorus of Tarsus, § 123, note 3. Concerning the physico-theological proof he followed the earlier theologians, especially Athanasius, and Gregory of Nazianzum.

(2) We can give here only the knots of the argument, the thread of reasoning must be seen from the connection. Monol. i.: Cum tam innumerabilia bona sint, quorum tam multam diversitatem et sensibus corporeis experimur et ratione mentis discernimus, estne credendum esse unum aliquid, per quod

unum sunt bona, quæcunque bona sunt, aut sunt bona alia per aliud?......III. Denique non solum omnia bona per idem aliquid sunt bona et omnia magna per idem aliquid sunt magna, sed quicquid est per *unum* aliquid videtur esse......Quoniam ergo cuncta quæ sunt, sunt per ipsum unum: procul dubio et ipsum unum est per se ipsum. Quæcunque igitur alia sunt, sunt per aliud, et ipsum solum per se ipsum. At quicquid est per aliud, minus est quam illud per quod cuncta sunt alia et quod solum est per se: quare illud quod est per se, maxime omnium est. Est igitur unum aliquid, quod solum maxime et summe omnium est; quod autem maxime omnium est et per quod est quicquid est bonum vel magnum, et omnino quicquid est aliquid est, id necesse est esse summe bonum et summe magnum et summum omnium quæ sunt. Quare est aliquid, quod sive essentia, sive substantia, sive natura dicatur, optimum et maximum est et summum omnium quæ sunt. Comp. § 123, note 4. The mode of argument which is found, Proscl. c. ii. is more original (he there proceeds from the reality of an idea.) The *fool* may say in his heart: there is no God (Ps. xiv. 1), but he thereby shews himself a fool, because he asserts something which is contradictory in itself. He has the idea of God *in* him, but denies its reality. But if God exists in idea, he must also exist in reality. Otherwise the *real* God, whose existence we may comprehend, would be superior to the one who exists only in imagination, and consequently would be superior to the highest imaginable object, which is absurd; hence it follows, that that, beyond which nothing can be conceived to exist, really exists (thus idea and reality coincide.) Convincitur ergo insipiens, esse vel in intellectu aliquid, quo nihil majus cogitari potest; quia hoc cum audit, intelligit, et quicquid intelligitur in intellectu est. Et certe id, *quo majus cogitari nequit, non potest esse in intellectu solo. Si enim vel in solo intellectu est, potest cogitari esse et in re, quod majus est. Si ergo id, quo majus cogitari non potest, est in solo intellectu: id ipsum, quo majus cogitari non potest, est quo majus cogitari potest: sed certe hoc esse non potest. Existit ergo procul dubio aliquid, quo majus cogitari non valet et in intellectu et in re.* If therefore the fool says; there is no God, he *says* it indeed, and may perhaps even *think* it. But there is a difference between thought and thought. To imagine a thing which is like a word without meaning, *e. g.* that fire is water (a mere sound, an absurdity!), is very different from conceiving a thought which corresponds to the word by which it is expressed. It is only according to the former mode of thinking (which destroys the thought itself), that the fool can say: there is no God, but not according to the latter.

(3) *Gaunilo* was a monk in the monastery of Marmoutier. He wrote: Liber pro insipiente adv. Anselmi in Proslogio ratiocinationem (in Anselmi Opp. p. 32. Gerb. p. 53.)[a] The idea of a thing does not necessarily imply its reality; there are many false ideas. Yea, it is very questionable, whether we can at all form an idea of God, since he is above all idea......If one, in speaking of an island which he asserted to be more perfect and lovely than all known islands, would infer its existence from this, that it could not be more perfect, if it did not exist, we should hardly know whether to think him the greatest fool who conducted such an argument, or him who gave his assent to it. The opposite method is to be adopted; we must first prove the existence of the island, and may then show that its excellence surpasses that of all others, etc. (comp. *Münscher* von Cölln ii. p. 33, 34. "*It is easy to perceive that Gaunilo argued against Anselm from the empirical point of view, and consequently took quite a different ground.*" Möhler, l. c. p. 152. *Anselm* defended himself against Gaunilo in his treatise: Liber apologeticus contra Gaunilonem respondentem pro insipiente (it is also called contra Insipientem, Opp. p. 34. Gerberon, p. 37.) He returns to the above distinction between thought and thought, and rejects the illustration taken from the island as altogether inappropriate. He observes, that if Gaunilo could *really* imagine an island more perfect than could ever be conceived, he would make him a present of it. "*In the opinion of Anselm the idea of the most perfect being was a necessary idea, between which, and the arbitrary and imaginary notion of a most excellent island no parallel could be drawn.*" *Möhler*, p. 153. (Comp. *Hegel*, Encyclopædie der philosophischen Wissenschaften, 2d edit. 1827. p. 61, ss. p. 181.: "*Anselm was right in declaring only that to be perfect which exists not only subjectively, but also objectively. In vain we affect to*

---

[a] Anselm was probably unacquainted with the author of the treatise in question. It is quoted as the work *incerti auctoris* in the earlier editions of Anslem's works. Comp. *Gerberon*, T. i. p. ii.

despise this proof, commonly called the ontological, and this definition of the perfect set forth by Anselm; it is inherent in the mind of every unprejudiced man, and re-appears in every system of philosophy, though against the knowledge and even the will of philosophers, as well as in the principle of direct faith." On the question, whether the proof of Anselm can be properly called a proof, see *Möhler*, l. c. p. 154. Respecting the entire controversy comp. *Zeigler, W. C. L.*, Beitrag zur Geschichte des Glaubens an Gott. Gött. 1792, 8.

(4) The theory of Anselm "*has gained a considerable historical reputation. It was not only applied in different ways, and further developed by eminent writers, but, up to the present day, it has been either opposed or defended, according to the respective character of every philosophical school.*" Möhler, p. 150.

(5) "*Hugo did not perceive the depth of Anselm's idea, since he was deceived by the superficial, dialectic reasoning of Gaunilo.*" *Liebner*, Hugo Von St Victor p. 369. The argument from contingency which *Peter of Poitiers* afterwards adopted, is given in Hugo's treatise: de sacramentis c. 7—9, de tribus dieb. c. 17, quoted by *Liebner*, p. 369, 370. It is as follows: Reason which, as the creature and image of God, is able to know him, is distinguished from the body in which it dwells, and from all that is sensuous, as that which is invisible and spiritual. But it is aware that it has not always been either active or conscious of itself, and that therefore there was a time when it did not exist: for it is impossible to conceive of a faculty of perception without beginning and consciousness. It must therefore have had a commencement. Possessing a spiritual nature, it cannot possibly derive its origin from the sensuous, but must necessarily have been created out of nothing; hence it follows that it owes its existence to an external author. But the author himself cannot have been created, for all that is created cannot give existence to another being. We must therefore assume the existence of an independent and eternal being as the first cause. (This proof occupies, as it were, an intermediate position between the cosmological and the ontological. The cosmological proof has the world for its foundation, the ontological the idea, and the argument of Hugo rests on the basis of the spirit.) Hugo made also use of the cosmological and physico-theological proofs, the latter of which was at that time the most

popular. Nor did *Peter Lombard* use the proof of Anselm; Sententt. i. dist. 3. comp. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 34.

(6) Summæ, P. i. Qu. 2. art. i. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 35. *Schröckh*, xxix. p. 77. His argument amounts to this, that the proposition: "*God exists*," may be regarded as established, if considered in itself (quantum in se est), since predicate and subject do not differ; but it is not so in regard to ourselves. Thomas connected the various modes of argumentation with each other on the principle which had previously been adopted by *Richard of St Victor*, de Trin. i. c. 6, ss. (comp. *Engelhardt*, Richard von St. Victor, p. 99, ss. [*Münscher*, l. c. p. 35.]) He enumerated five different kinds of proof: 1. that derived from the first moving principle (primum movens), which is not itself moved by any other principle; 2. that derived from the first great cause (causa efficiens); 3. that derived from what is necessary by itself (per se necessarium) (these first three kinds form together the cosmological proof in its dialectic form); 4. that derived from the gradation of things (or the argument from the imperfect to the absolute perfect; Augustine and Anselm had propounded the same proof); 5. that derived from the adaptation of things (the physico-theological, or teleological proof.) [*Münscher*, l. c. p. 36.]

(7) *Abelard* had previously directed attention to this proof (Theol. christ. Lib. v. *Martène*, p. 1439), but not so much to a strictly cogent *proof* (magis honestis, quam necessariis rationibus nitimur), as to the voice of conscience. Quam honestum vero sit ac salubre omnia ad unum optimum tam rectorem quam conditorem spectare et cuncta potius ratione quam casu fieri seu regi, nullus est cui propriæ ratio non suggerat conscientiæ. Quæ enim sollicitudo bonorum nobis operum inesset, si, quem nec amore nec timore vereremur, Deum penitus ignoraremus? Quæ spes aut malitiam refrænaret potentum, aut ad bona eos alliceret opera, si omnium justissimus ac potentissimus frustra crederetur? Ponamus itaque ut, dum bonis prodesse ac placere quærimus, obstinatos cogere non possimus, cum ora eorum non necessariis obstruamus argumentis. Ponamus, inquam, hoc si volunt; sed opponamus, quod nolunt, summam eorum impudentiam arguentes, si hoc calumniantur, quod refellere nullo modo possunt, et quod plurima tam honestate quam utilitate commendatur. Inquiramus eos, qua ratione malint eligere, Deum non esse, quam esse, et cum ad neutrum cogi necessario possint et alterum multis commendetur rationibus, alterum nullis: ini-

quissimam eorum confundamus impudentiam, qui id quod optimum esse non dubitent, omnibusque est tam rationibus, quam auctoritatibus consentaneum, sequi respuant et contrarium complectantur.—The argument used by *Raimund* had more of the form of a proof, Theolog. natural. Tit. 83, quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 38. *Tennemann*, Geschichte der Philos. viii. p. 964, ss. Since man is an accountable being, but can neither reward nor punish himself, it follows, that there must be a being superior to him, who bestows rewards and inflicts punishments; for if there were no such being, the life of man would be fruitless, a game of chance. As, moreover, the irrational creation is subject to man, and exists for his sake, it would follow, that it were a thing to no purpose, if no corresponding higher being were above man. But now we perceive order and harmony in the whole external creation which is subject to man;[a] how can we suppose that less order exists in the moral world, than in the natural? As the eye corresponds to things visible, the ear to things audible, and reason to things comprehensible, so the moral actions of man must have their corresponding judgment and retribution, and consequently a judge and retributer. But this judge must possess a perfect knowledge of all human actions, and an insight into their moral nature, that is to say, he must be omniscient; it is also evident, that he must be just, in the highest sense of the word; and, lastly, he must be possessed of unlimited power to execute his judgments, or, in other words, he must be almighty. But such a being cannot but be the most perfect of all beings, *i. e.* God. (The similarity between this proof and that of Kant has often been pointed out.)

(8) Comp. Triumph. cruc. Lib. i. c. 6, p. 38, ss. quoted by *Meier*, p. 245.

(9) Sententt. 1. Dist. 2. Qu. 2. art. 1. quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 36. *Tiedemann*, Geist der Speculativen Philosophie, iv. p. 632. An objection was especially made to the proof derived from the necessarium per se, inasmuch as Scotus

---

[a] Raimund directs our attention to the gradation of beings. Some of them only *exist* (inorganic beings); others *exist* and *live* (plants); still others *exist*, *live*, and are *susceptible of sensations* (animals); and, lastly, some *exist*, *live*, *are susceptible of sensations*, and *think* (man.) In man all the other stages are repeated.

made a distinction between the ideas of possibility and necessity.

(10) Centiloq. theol. Concl. 1. *Tiedemann*, l. c. v. p. 206. He opposed the principal argument of Aristotle derived from the πρῶτον κινοῦν.

(11) *Wessel* reasoned as follows: The general and most direct means by which man attains God, is the *original consciousness of God* which is inherent in every rational spirit. As no place is so dark as not to receive some light or other from a sun-beam, so no rational soul is without some sort of indwelling notion (notitia) of God......(Ps. xix. 6.) This knowledge, however, is not the same in all men, but developes itself differently in different persons according to their other talents, and their whole moral and intellectual condition; in like manner, the universal light of the sun is differently received by different objects according to their susceptibility, position, and distance. Wessel designates the said simple and universal knowledge of God as the *name* of God, which dwells, as it were, in every spirit, is expressed in every soul, and may, therefore, in every soul be brought to consciousness; de orat. Lib. v. *Ullmann*, p. 200.

(12) *Tauler*, Predigten, vol. i. p. 58: I possess a power in my soul which is in every way susceptible of God; I am as sure as I live, that no thing is so near to me as God. *God is nearer to me than I am to myself*, etc. Comp. the following §, note 3.

§ 164.

GOD AS A BEING THAT MAY BE COMPREHENDED.

In proportion as men presume to prove the existence of God, they will pretend with more or less boldness to a knowledge of his nature. Hence the scholastic divines made the nature of God the special object of their speculations. Nevertheless they expressly asserted, that God cannot be comprehended, and admitted for the most part, that he can be known but partially by man.(1) (The views of *Ockam* on this subject bordered upon scepticism.)(2) The mystics, on the contrary, endeavoured, in opposition both to a cold dogmatism and to scepticism, to live a hidden life in God, and *thus* to obtain an intuitive vision of God himself in his light, and of all things in God.(3)

(1) *John Damascenus* de fide orthod. i. 4, had taught, after the example of some of the earlier Fathers, that God does not come under the category of things (οὐδὲν γὰρ τῶν ὄντων ἐστὶν) which amounts to nothing less than the modern speculative idea of God, *i. e.* to a nonentity. He is ὑπὲρ γνῶσιν πάντως καὶ ὑπὲρ οὐσίαν, and it is only by way of negation (δι’ ἀφαιρέσεως), that we acquire the knowledge of his attributes (comp. what Clement of Alexandria said in an earlier period, § 37, note.) *John Scotus Erigena* went still farther, and, assuming more than is lawful for man to do, he maintained, de divis. nat. ii. 28, p. 78: that God does not know himself. Deus itaque nescit se quid est, quia non est *quid ;* incomprehensibilis quippe in aliquo et sibi ipsi et omni intellectui.—The more modest *Anselm*, on the contrary, returned to more correct views, by confessing in his Monolog., that God alone knows his own nature, and that no human wisdom can so much as presume to measure, or to comprehend the Divine wisdom. For, it is certain, that what we ascribe to God only relatively, does not express his nature (si quid de summa natura dicitur relative, non est ejus significativum substantiæ.) Compare the passages (from c. 31, 64, 65,) quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 44, and *Möhler*, l. c. p. 154, 55. Similar language occurs in Alan. ab. Ins. de art. cathol. fidei. 16, 17, quoted by *Pez*, i. p. 482. *Albertus Magnus* distinguishes between attingere Deum intellectu, and comprehendere. Creatures can only attain to the former. Comp. Summa theol. i. tr. iv. qu. 18, membr. 3. p. 67. Resting on this basis, *Thomas Aquinas* (Summæ P. i. Qu. 12, art. 12,) proved that man has no cognitionem quidditativam of God, (*i. e.* no knowledge of God adequate to the Divine Being,) *but only knows habitudinem ipsius ad creaturas*, while *Scotus* (Sent. i. Dist. 3, Qu.i. art. 1,) taught the opposite doctrine. The final result of the controversy carried on between the Thomists and Scotists de cognitione Dei quidditativa was. that it was decided, that man has a cognitio quidditatis Dei, but not a cognitio quidditativa, *i. e.* that he may know the *nature* of God (in opposition to a mere *accidental* and superficial notion,) but that he cannot know God thoroughly, *i. e.* in such a manner

as that no part of his nature should be concealed from man.)[a] Comp. the passages quoted by *Münscher*, ed by von Cölln. p. 63, 64, and *Eberhard*, natürliche Theologie der Scolastiker, p. 52–66.—*Durandus of St. Pourcain* informs us (in Magistri Sentent. i. Dist. 3. Qu. i.) of a threefold way which leads to the knowledge of God: 1. *Via eminentiæ*, which ascends from the excellencies of creatures to the idea of the highest excellency, *i. e.* to the perfect God. 2. *Via causalitatis*, which ascends from the phenomena of creation to the first cause. 3. *Via remotionis*, which begins with changeable and dependent existence, and ends with necessary and absolute existence (esse de se.)—*Alexander Hales* used similar and still simpler expressions (Summa, P. i. Qu. 2. Membr. i. Art. 2.): Dicendum, quod est cognitio de Deo *per modum positionis et per modum privationis*. Per modum privationis cognoscimus de Deo quid non est, per modum positionis quid est. Divina substantia in sua immensitate non est cognoscibilis ab anima rationali cognitione positiva, sed est cognoscibilis cognitione privativa. Comp. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, l. c. On the endeavours of later Greek theologians, *e. g. Nicholas of Methone*, (especially after the example of Dionysius the Areopagite) to represent the insufficiency of our knowledge and terminology respecting Divine things, see *Ullmann*, l. c. p. 72–74: The Divine is in no wise to be confounded and compared with all that exists: on the whole, it would be better to express in an exaggerated and exceptional manner (ὑπεροχικῶς καὶ κατεξαίρετον) all that is predicated of the Divine, etc.

(2) In Quodlibet. theol. I. Qu. 1, he establishes a position, and a negative definition of the nature of God. According to the first: "Deus est aliquid nobilius et aliquid melius omni alio a se;" according to the second, "Deus est quo nihil est melius, prius vel perfectius." The former may be used as an argument for the *unity*, but not for the existence of God, inasmuch as the latter idea cannot be proved by demonstration. The second

---

[a] *Cajetanus* Summæ P. 1. Qu. 12, de arte et essentia c. 6, Qu. 4: Aliud est cognoscere quidditatem, s. *cognitio quidditatis*: aliud est *cognitio quidditativa*, s. cognoscere quidditative. Cognoscit nempe leonis *quidditatem*, quicunque novit *aliquid* ejus prædicatum essentiale. Cognoscit autem *quidditative* non nisi ille qui *omnia* prædicata quidditativa usque ad ultimam differentiam novit. The passage is quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, l. c.

may be appealed to in support of the doctrine of the *existence*, but not of the unity of God, since it may be supposed that such negative perfections belong to several individuals. From this point of view he refutes the arguments used by the earlier scholastics, especially Duns Scotus. In the Centiloq. concl. 2, he combats the argument derived from this "first cause;" nor does he give his assent to the argument derived from "the uniformity of the world." Thus he arrives at the following conclusion: Conclusio. quod non sunt plures Dei, non tanquam demonstrata. sed tanquam *probabilior* suo opposito tenenda est: eo quod omnes apparentiæ æqualiter apparent, et faciliter possunt salvari tenendo unitatem primæ causæ.]

(3) Thus *Gerson* said, (contra vanam curiositatem, lectio secunda, t. i. p. 100, quoted by *Ch. Schmidt*, p. 73): Fides saluberrima et omnis metaphysica tradit nobis, quod Deus est simplicissimus in supremo simplicitatis gradu, supra quam imaginari sufficimus. Hoc dato, quid opus est ipsam unitissimam essentiam per formas metaphysices vel quidditates vel rationes ideales vel alias mille imaginandi vias secernere, dividere, constituere, præscindere ex parte rei, ut dicunt, et non ex intellectus negotiatione circa eam? Deus sancte, quot tibi prioritates, quot instantia, quot signa, quot modeitates, quot rationes aliqui ultra Scotum condistinguunt! Jam mille codices talibus impleti sunt, adeo ut longa ætas hominum eos vix sufficiat legere, ne dicam intelligere.—Gerson's theory of the knowledge of God (viz. the knowledge of God through love) was appropriately designated, both by himself and by other theologians, as *Theologia affectiva* (Tract. iii. super magnificat. T. iv. p. 262.) *Suso* expressed himself as follows in his treatise: Eine Ausrichtung, wo und wie Gott ist (see *Diepenbrock* das Leben und die Schriften von Heinrich von Suso, 1837, p. 212, c. lv.): Most men assert, that the idea of space cannot be applied to God, but that he is all in all. But now open the inner ears of your soul, and open them wide. The same masters maintain in the science called Logica, that we obtain the knowledge of a thing by means of its name. Thus a certain teacher asserts, that the name *being* is the first name of God. Consider being in all its simplicity; look at being only as such, and as it is unmixed with nonentity; for all that has no existence is contrary to that which has existence; the case is the same with being as such, for it is contrary to all that has no existence. Any thing which

either has already existed, or has yet to exist, does not now exist in essential presence. But now mixed existence or non-existence cannot be known but by some mark of that being which is in all. For if we wish to comprehend any thing, reason meets first with existence, viz. that being which has made all things. This is the compound existence of some creature or other; for all compound existence is mixed up with something else, viz. the possibility of receiving something. Hence it follows, that the nameless Divine being must be in itself the being which is all in all, and preserves all compound beings by its omnipresence." Ibidem, p. 214: "Now open your inner eyes, and look, if possible, at the [Divine] being in all its simplicity and purity, and you will find that it owes its existence to none, has neither a 'before' nor an 'after,' and undergoes no change either from within, or from without, because it is a simple being. You will then be convinced that this being is the *most real*, *omnipresent*, and *most perfect* of all beings, in which there is neither defect nor change, because it is a single unity in perfect simplicity. And this truth is so manifest to the enlightened reason of man, that it cannot conceive of any other. For one thing proves and causes the other. Since God is a simple being, he must necessarily be the first of all beings, created by none, and existing from eternity; since he is the first of all beings, eternal and simple, he must be omnipresent. It is a necessary quality of highest perfection and simplicity, that nothing can either be added to, or taken from it. If you understand what I have said of the simple Godhead, you will know something of the incomprehensible light of the hidden truth of God. This pure, simple being is the first cause of all actual existence; from its peculiar omnipresence it follows that it includes all that has come into existence in time, as the beginning and the end of all things. It is in all things, and out of all things, therefore a certain master says: '*God is a circular ring, the centre of which is everywhere, and the periphery of which is nowhere.*' Compare with these expressions the language of *Tauler*, (§ 163. note 11), of *Ruysbroek*, quoted by *Engelhardt*, p. 173, (God as such), and of the author of the "deutsche Theologie," cap. 1. where the practical point of view is most prominently brought forward, viz. the necessity of leading a godly life, in order to know God.

§ 165.

THE NATURE OF GOD IN GENERAL.

(Pantheism and Theism.)

The ingenious system of *John Scotus Erigena,* who, for scientific purposes, endeavoured philosophically to establish the contrast between God and the world (nature),(1) was so misunderstood and misused by some of his close imitators, such as *Amalrich of Bena,* and *David of Dinanto,* as to give rise to a gross adoration of the flesh.(2) It was combated by *Albertus Magnus,* and *Thomas Aquinas,*(3) and condemned by the Council of Paris (A. D. 1209,) and the fourth Lateran council (A. D. 1215.)(4) The mystics also exposed themselves to the charge of Pantheism by asserting that nothing except God has a real existence.(5) But the more considerate among them retained, in accordance with orthodox theologians, the theistic principle of a difference between God and his creatures, though they could not always scientifically prove that to which they practically adhered.(6)

(1) In his Dialogus de divisione nature *Erigena* divided all nature (which comprehends all existence) into four modes of existence: 1. Natura creans, sed non creata, *i. e.* God; 2. Natura creans et creata, *i. e.* the Son of God; 3. Natura creata et non creans, *i. e.* the world; and. 4. Natura non creata et non creans, *i. e.* God as the final object of all things.) Inasmuch as Erigena regarded God as the principle and cause of all things, he arrived at the conviction that the Divine being, the goodness, power, and wisdom of God, could not be created by another being, because there is no higher being from which it could derive its existence. But since he regards, on the other hand, the Divine being as the last object at which all things aim, and which is the end of their course, he hence concludes, that this nature is neither created nor creating; for as every thing which has gone out from it returns to it, and as all existence depends on it, we can-

not say that it creates any thing. What could God be supposed to create, as he will be all in all things, and can at the same time represent himself in no other being, but in himself? Therefore he says, i. 74, p. 42: Cum audimus, Deum omnia facere, nihil aliud debemus intelligere, quam *Deum in omnibus esse*, hoc est essentiam omnium subsistere. Ipse enim solus per se vere est et omne quod vere in his, quæ sunt, dicitur esse, ipse solus est.—The following expressions are very beautiful, but might easily be misunderstood, i. 76, p. 43: Omne quodcunque in creaturis vere bonum vereque pulcrum et amabile intelligitur, ipse est. Sicut enim nullum bonum essentiale est, ita nullum pulcrum seu amabile essentiale præter ipsum solum. Comp. *Tennemann*, viii. 1, p. 80, ss. *Schmid*, über den Mysticismus des Mittelalters, p. 123, ss. *Frommüller* in the Tübinger Zeitschrift, 1830, part 1, p. 58, ss. *Staudenmaier*, Freiburger Zeitschrift, 1840, iii. 2, p. 272, ss. [*Münscher*, von Cölln, ii. p. 40, 41.]

(2) Comp. § 153, note 4. From the proposition that he who loves, is in God, they inferred the following conclusion: "*that which is done in love* is no sin: therefore stealing, robbing, committing lasciviousness, etc. is not sinful, if it be done in love." Comp. Ditmars Chronik, edited by *Grautoff. Hurter*, Innocent III. vol. ii. p. 238 ss. Cæsarius of Heisterbach (A. D. 1222) de miraculis, lib. v. c. 22: Si aliquis est in Spiritu sancto, ajebant, et faciat fornicationem, aut aliquæ alia pollutione polluatur: non est ei peccatum, quia ille Spiritus, qui est Deus omnino separatus a carne, non potest peccare quamdiu ille Spiritus, qui est Deus, est in eo, ille operatur omnia in omnibus. *Engelhardt*, Kirchenhistorische Abhandlungen, p. 255, ss. Compare also § 184. (*Gieseler*, Kirchengesch. ii. § 74, note g.)

(3) [*Albert M.* Summæ theol. P. i. Tract. iv. Qu. 20. *Thom. Aq.* Sentent. lib. ii. Dist. 17. Qu. 1. art. 1: Quomodam antiquorum philosophorum error fuit, quod Deus esset de essentia omnium rerum. Ponebant enim, omnia esse unum simpliciter, et non differre, nisi forte secundum sensum vel æstimationem, ut Parmenides dicit; et illos etiam antiquos philosophos secuti sunt quidam moderni, ut David de Dinando. Divisit enim res in partes tres, in corpore, animas, et substantias æternas separatas. Et primum indivisibile, ex quo constituuntur corpora, dixit ὕλη, h. e. materiam. Primum autem indivisibile, ex quo constituuntur animæ, dixit νοῦς h. e. mentem. Primum autem indivisibile

in substantios æternis dixit Deum: et hæc tria esse unum et idem. Ex quo iterum consequitur, esse omnia, per essentiam, vocem.]

(4 [Comp. *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 42.]

(5 *Master Eckart* approached pantheism nearer than any other mystic. He said: "God is nothing, and God is something. That which is something is also nothing; what God is once, he is at all times."—(Sermon on the feast of the conversion of St. Paul, fol. 243, b. (quoted by *Schmidt* in the Studien und Kritiken 1839. part 3, p. 692)—"He (God) has the nature of all creatures *in* him, he is a being which has all beings in him."—"All that is in the Godhead is a *unity*, and we must not speak of it. *God* acts, but not the *Godhead;* it is not to be expected that the latter should work, since there is no work in it. There is the same difference between God and the Godhead, with that which exists between working and not working." (Sermon on the day of the execution of John the Baptist, fol. 302, a. quoted by *Schmidt*, l. c. 693.)—In Eckart's opinion God becomes God only through the work of creation. "Prior to the creation of the world God was not God, but he was what he was; nor was God in himself God, after creatures had been brought into existence, but he was only God in them." (Second sermon on All Saint's Day, fol. 307, a. *Schmidt*, l. c. p. 694.)—"*Pantheism is a great and noble phenomenon deceiving us by a peculiar charm in the case of those who burn with love, and are, as it were, intoxicated with a sense of God, and the contemplation of Divine things. But where it is only the result of subtile conclusions and doctrinal definitions, or the proud but confused speculation of an indefinite religious feeling, it loses its grand relations, its mysterious poetry, and those faults which we once felt disposed to overlook, now become manifest, together with all the contradictions in which they involve us.*" *Schmidt*, l. c.

(6) *Suso* showed in highly characteristic language that a pantheistic disposition was nothing but a transitory excitement of the mind, which must first of all subside (in a quotation given by *Diepenbrock*, p. 189)—"I call that state of our mind flourishing, in which the inner man is cleansed from sinful carnality, and delivered from remaining imperfections; in which he cheerfully rises above time and place, while he was formerly bound, and could not make free use of his natural nobility. When he at

that time opens the eyes of his mind, when he tastes other and better pleasures which consist in the perception of the truth, in the enjoyment of Divine happiness, in insight into the present moment of eternity, etc., and when the created mind begins to comprehend a part of the eternal, uncreated mind both in itself and in all things around it, then he is moved by strange feelings. Examining himself and reflecting on what he once *was*, and what he now *is*, he recollects that he was a poor, ungodly, and wretched man, that he was blind, and lived far from God; but now he thinks "*that he is filled with the Divine essence, that there is nothing which is not God, that God and all things are one and the same thing. He then goes too hastily to work, he becomes excited in his mind like wine which is in a state of fermentation, and has not as yet formed a sediment,*" *etc.* Such men are like bees which make honey; when they are full grown, and come for the first time out of their hives, they fly about in an irregular manner, not knowing whither to go; some take the wrong direction, and lose themselves, but others come back to the right place. Thus it is with the men before spoken of, when they perceive God to be all in all, without their reason being regulated," &c. *Gerson* acutely defended the distinction between God and the creature (however highly it may be favoured) in opposition to Ruysbroek and Eckart, though he was not always consistent with himself. Comp. *Hundeshagen*, p. 62, ss. *Tauler* maintained (Predigten, vol. i. p. 61), that nothing prevented the soul so much from knowing God as time and space; time and space are in his opinion parts, but God is a unity; therefore if the soul will know God, it must know him by going *beyond* time and *beyond* space; for God is neither the one nor the other, as those manifold things are, but he is a unity. The assertion of *Wessel* that "God alone *exists*, and that all other things are *what* they are, through *him*" (de orat. iii. 12, p. 76), and some other of his propositions might lead us to suppose that he too was a pantheist, but compare on the other hand the appropriate observation of *Ullmann*, p. 230, note.

§ 166.

THE ATTRIBUTES OF GOD.

a. The Relation of God to Time, Space, and Number. (The Omnipresence, Eternity, and Unity of God.)

The writings of *John Damascenus,*(1) and his successors in the Greek church,(2) contain less ample definitions and classifications on this point, than the more copious works of the schoolmen. *Anselm* and others endeavoured to point out the importance of the proposition laid down by Augustine, that the attributes of God not only form one whole, but are also identical with the Divine Being itself, and cannot therefore be regarded as something foreign and manifold, which is merely attached to God.(3) But the speculative and systematizing tendency of the scholastics frequently induced them to lose sight of this simple truth. Concerning the omnipresence of God, some, *e. g. Hugo and Richard of St. Victor,* defended the *omnipresence* of the Divine substance in opposition to the doctrine of the omnipresence of a mere Divine influence, while others endeavoured to unite the two.(4) A difference was also made between the *eternity* of God, and a mere *sempiternitas,* the latter of which may be possessed even by creatures (*e. g.* angels and the souls of men.)(5) And, lastly, it was asserted that the *unity* of God, which many of the schoolmen numbered among his attributes, was not to be regarded as a mere mathematical quality. The theologians of the Greek church signified this by extending the idea of a numerical unity to the unity which is above all other things.(6)

---

(1) Joh. Dam. de fide orth. i. 4 : Ἄπειρον οὖν τὸ ϑεῖον καὶ ἀκατάληπτον· καὶ τοῦτο μόνον αὐτοῦ κατάληπτον, ἡ ἀπειρία καὶ ἀκαταληψία· ὅσα δὲ λέγομεν ἐπὶ ϑεοῦ καταφατικῶς, οὐ τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ περὶ τὴν φύσιν δηλοῖ· κἂν ἀγαθὸν, κἂν δίκαιον, κἂν σοφὸν, κἂν ὅ τι ἂν ἄλλο εἴπης, οὐ φύσιν λέγεις ϑεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὰ περὶ τὴν φύσιν· εἰσὶ δὲ καί τινα καταφατικῶς λεγόμενα ἐπὶ ϑεοῦ, δύναμιν

ὑπεροχικῆς ἀποφάσεως ἔχοντα· οἷον, σκότος λέγοντες ἐπὶ ϑεοῦ, οὐ σκότος νοοῦμεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἐστι φῶς, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τὸ φῶς· καὶ φῶς, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστι σκότος. Comp. cap. 9: Τὸ ϑεῖον ἁπλοῦν ἐστι καὶ ἀσύνϑετον· τὸ δὲ ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρων συγκείμενον, συνϑετόν ἐστιν. Εἰ οὖν τὸ ἄκτιστον καὶ ἄναρχον καὶ ἀσώματον καὶ ἀϑάνατον καὶ αἰώνιον καὶ ἀγαθὸν καὶ δημιουργικὸν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐσιώδεις διαφορὰς εἴπομεν ἐπὶ ϑεοῦ, ἐκ τοσούτων συγκείμενον, οὐχ ἁπλοῦν ἔσται, ἀλλὰ σύνϑετον· ὅπερ ἐσχάτης ἀσεβείας ἐστίν· χρὴ τοίνυν ἕκαστον τῶν ἐπὶ ϑεοῦ λεγομένων, οὐ τί κατ' οὐσίαν ἐστὶ σημαίνειν οἴεσϑαι, ἀλλ' ἢ τί οὐκ ἐστι δηλοῦν, ἢ σχέσιν τινά πρός τι τῶν ἀντιδιαστελλομένων, ἤ τι τῶν παρεπομένων τῇ φύσει ἢ ἐνέργειαν. Comp. cap. 19, and what was said § 164, note 1.

(2) Comp. *Ullmann*, Nicolaus von Methone, etc. p. 69, ss., and § 164, note 1.

(3) Monol. c. 14, ss. God is not only just, but he is justice itself, etc. cap. 16: Quid ergo, si illa summa natura tot bona est, eritne composita tot pluribus bonis, an potius non sunt plura bona, sed unum bonum tam pluribus nominibus significatum? C. 17: Cum igitur illa natura nullo modo composita sit et tamen omni modo tot illa bona sit [sint], necesse est, ut illa omnia non plura, sed unum sint. Idem igitur est quodlibet unum illorum quod omnia [sunt] sive simul, sive singula, ut cum dicitur vel justitia vel essentia, idem significet quod alia, vel omnia simul, vel singula. *Hugo of St Victor* adopted similar views, see Liebner, p. 371. Comp. also *Abelard*, theolog. christ. iii. p. 1264: Non itaque sapientia in Deo vel substantialis ei forma vel accidentalis, imo sapientia ejus ipse Deus est. Idem de potentia ejus sentiendum est et de cæteris quæ ex nominum affinitate formæ esse videntur in Deo quoque sicut in creaturis, etc. *Alanus* also said, l. c. art. 20, (quoted by Pez, i. p. 484): Nomina enim ista: potentia potens, sapientia sapiens neque formam, neque proprietatem, neque quicquid talium Deo attribuere possunt, cum simplicissimus Deus in sua natura nihil sit talium capax. Cum ergo ratiocinandi de Deo causa nomina nominibus copulamus, nihil quod non sit ejus essentia prædicamus, et si transsumtis nominibus de Deo quid credimus, improprie balbutimus.

(4) *Hugo of St Victor* de sacram. Lib. i. P. ii. c. 17: Deus substantialiter sive essentialiter et proprie et vere est in omni creatura sive natura sine sui definitione et in omni loco sine circumscriptione et omni tempore sine vicissitudine vel mutatione. Est ergo, ubi est, totum, qui continet totum et penetrat totum; see *Liebner*, p. 372. From the proposition that God is potenti-

aliter in all things, *Richard of St Victor* drew the inference that he also exists essentialiter in them, de Trin. ii. 24, see *Engelhardt*, p. 174. He is *above* all the heavens, and yet he is at the same time *in* them, he is in all that is corporeal and spiritual, in all that he has created, and governs according to his will. This notion of an essential presence of God was substantially the same as that of Peter Lombard, though he acknowledged that it was above human comprehension, Sent. i. Dist. 27, g. According to *Alexander Hales* God is in all things, but he is not *included* in the same; he is without all things, but he is not *excluded* from them. God exists in things in a threefold manner: essentialiter, præsentialiter, potentialiter; these three modes, however, do not differ in themselves, but only in our idea of them. God does not exist in all things in the same manner, *e. g.*, in those whose sins are pardoned, in the sacraments, etc. The question was also started: Can the indwelling grace of God be in the body of a man prior to its union with his soul? etc., see *Cramer* vii. p. 295, 7. The definitions of *Thomas Aquinas* are based on the system of Alexander, Summæ 1. Qu. 8. art. 1. (quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln. p. 49): Deus est in omnibus rebus, non quidem sicut pars essentiæ, vel sicut accidens, sed sicut *agens adest ei in quod agit.* Oportet enim omne agens conjungi ei in quod immediate agit, et *sua virtute illud contingere*.........Art. 2: Deus omnem locum replet, *non sicut corpus*......immo per hoc replet omnia loca, quod dat esse omnibus locatis, quæ replent omnia loca. Art. 3: Substantia sua adest omnibus ut *causa essendi*, etc. The dynamic (virtualis) scheme of the Thomists was opposed by the ideal view of the Scotists. See *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 50.—*Bonaventura*, Comp. Theol. (Edit. Mogunt. 1609, p. 695,) said: Ubique Deus est, tamen nusquam est, quia nec abest ulli loco, nec ullo capitur loco. (August.) Deus est in mundo non inclusus, extra mundum non exclusus, supra mundum non elatus, infra mundum non depressus. Ex his patet quod Deus est intra omnia, et hoc quia omnia replet et ubique præsens est. Ita extra omnia est, quia omnia continet, nec usquam valet coarctari. Sed nota, quod hæc propositio, extra, dicit ibi *non actualem præsentiam ad locum, sed potentialem*, quæ est Dei immensitas, quæ infinitos mundos potest replere, si essent. Idem ipse est supra omnia, quia omnibus præstat nec aliquid ei æquatur. Item infra omnia est, quia omnia sustinet et sine ipso nihil subsisteret. Dicimus etiam quod ubique est, non ut indigeat rebus, quod ex eis sit, sed potius res sui indigeant, ut per eum subsistant......Sciendum est ergo, ut aliquid est in loco *circumscriptive et diffinitive*, ut corpus; aliquid *diffinitive*, non circumscriptive, ut angelus; aliquid nec sic, nec sic, ut Deus, et hoc ideo, quia non individuatur per materiam, ut corpus, neque per suppositum, ut Angelus. Aliquid est etiam in loco, partim circumscriptive, partim diffinitive, ut corpus Christi in sacramento......Corpus autem Christi......in pluribus tamen locis est......sed non ubique......Nota quod Deus est multipliciter in rebus, scilicet per naturam, et sic est ubique potentialiter, præsentialiter, essentialiter. Item per gratiam, sic est in bonis......Item per gloriam, sic est in rationali virtute animæ, ut veritas, in concupiscibili, ut bonitas, in irascibili, ut potestas. Item per unionem, sic fuit in utero virginis unitus humanæ naturæ et in sepulcro unitus carni et in inferno unitus animæ Christi, etc. He even went so far as to ask, whether and in what manner God was in the devil? and to reply in the affirmative, inasmuch as the devil is composed of nature and spirit. *St Bernard* said in his meditations (cap. I. quoted by Bonaventura, l. c.): Deus in creaturis mirabilis, in hominibus amabilis, in angelis desiderabilis, in se ipso incomprehensibilis, in reprobis intolerabilis, item in damnatis ut terror et horror. *Tauler* also made a distinction between the presence of God in things, and that in men: God is no less present in a piece of wood and a stone, than in men, but the former are not conscious of it. If the piece of wood knew God, and felt his nearness, even as the highest angels know him, the one would be quite as happy as the other. Man is happier than a piece of wood, because he recognizes God, etc. (Predigten, vol. i. p. 58, 59.) [Comp. also *Anselm* Monol. c. 22. *Albertus Magnus* Summæ, P. i. Qu. 70. Membr. 1.]

(5) This was done, *e. g.* by *Alexander Hales*, see Cramer, l. c. p. 209, ss. Comp. *Bonaventura* Comp. i. 18. He defined æternitas (after the example of Boëthius) as interminabilis vitæ tota simul et perfecta possessio (interminabilitas.)

(6) *John Damascenus* de fide orth. i. 5. *Nich. of Methone*, Refut. p. 25, (quoted by *Ullmann*, l. c. p. 72,) said: " When we call the unity [God] beginning, we do not mean to draw a comparison between it and that which is posterior to the beginning; for the same reason we do not merely use the term " begin-

ning," without further qualifying it, but we say *over*-commencing beginning; nor do we restrict ourselves to the term "*unity*" as such, but we call it *the over-all-one;* and instead of the first and first of all, we say the *over*-first, instead of the great or the greatest, we make use of the term over-great." He called God the ὑπερέν, and even used the expression ὑπέρθεος μονάς καὶ τριάς. (Refut. 26) Comp. *Hugo of St. Victor*, quoted by *Leibner*, p. 371; he understood by unity not the numerical unity, but also simplicity (vera unitas), and immutability (summa unitas.) [*Abelard*, Introd. in Theol. L. iii. 2: Nulla tanta fieri concordia, vel regi possunt, quanta illa quæ unus tantum vel condit, vel regit. *Richard of St. Victor* de Trin. Lib. i. 14.]

§ 167.

b. THE RELATION OF GOD TO EXISTENCE—OMNIPOTENCE AND OMNISCIENCE.

The application of the Divine knowledge and power to things out of God gave easily rise to anthropomorphitic notions and absurd questions,(1) which were best removed by regarding the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience not as separate attributes, but in their connection with the Divine Being. *Anselm*(2) and *Abelard*(3) agreed in asserting that God can do everything which may be done without interfering with his infinite perfection; *Peter Lombard, Hugo of St Victor, Richard of St Victor,* and some others adopted the same view.(4) The *knowledge* of God was farther looked upon as being immediate and omnipresent, and a distinction was made between that aspect of this knowledge which refers to things (as *habitus*), and that which has regard to God himself (as *actus*.)(5) Respecting the Divine *omnipotence* some, *e. g. Abelard*, maintained that God could make nothing else and nothing better, than what he really makes;(6) others, *e. g. Hugo of St Victor*, thought this assertion blasphemous, because the infinite power of God is restricted by it within certain limits.(7)

(1) *E. g.* whether God could make undone that which is done? whether he could change a harlot into a pure virgin? and similar absurd questions; see the passages quoted § 152, note 5, from the work of Erasmus.

(2) Thus Anselm asserted, in reply to the question, whether God could lie, if he would? (Cur Deus homo, i. 12): Non sequitur, si Deus vult mentiri, justum esse mentiri, sed potius *Deum illum non esse.* Nam nequaquam potest velle mentiri voluntas, nisi in qua corrupta est veritas, immo quæ deserendo veritatem corrupta est. Cum ergo dicitur: si Deus vult mentiri, non est aliud, quam: si Deus talis est natura, quæ velit mentiri, etc. Comp. ii. 5: Denique Deus nihil facit necessitate, quia nullo modo cogitur aut prohibetur aliquid facere. Et cum dicimus Deum aliquid facere, quasi necessitate vitandi inhonestatem, quam utique non timet, potius intelligendum est, quia hoc facit necessitate servandæ honestatis, quæ scilicet necessitas non est aliud, quam immutabilitas honestatis ejus, quam a se ipso et non ab alio habet; et *idcirco improprie dicitur necessitas.* Ibid. 18: Quoties namque dicitur Deus *non posse,* nulla negatur in eo potestas, sed insuperabilis significatur potentia et fortitudo. Non enim aliud intelligitur, nisi quia nulla res potest efficere, ut agat ille, quod negatur posse. Nam multum usitata est hujusmodi locutio, ut dicatur res aliqua posse, non quia in illa, sed quoniam in alia re est potestas; et non posse, non quoniam in illa, sed quia in alia re est impotentia. Dicimus namque: iste homo potest vinci, pro: aliquis potest eum vincere, et; ille non potest vinci, pro: nullus eum vincere potest. Non enim potestas est, posse vinci, sed impotentia, nec vinci non posse impotentia est, sed potestas. Nec dicimus Deum necessitate facere aliquid eo, quod in illo sit ulla necessitas, sed quoniam est in alio, sicut dixi de impotentia, quando dicitur non posse. Omnis quippe necessitas est aut coactio, aut prohibitio, quæ duæ necessitates convertuntur invicem contrarie, sicut necesse est impossibile. Quidquid namque cogitur esse, prohibetur non esse, et quod cogitur non esse, prohibetur esse; quemadmodum quod necesse est esse, impossibile est non esse, et quod necesse est non esse, impossibile est esse, et conversim. Cum autem dicimus aliquid necesse esse aut non esse in Deo, non intelligitur, quod sit in illo necessitas aut cogens, aut prohibens, sed significatur, quod in omnibus aliis rebus est necessitas prohibens eas facere, et cogens non facere; contra hoc, quod de

Deo dicitur. Nam cum dicimus, quod necesse est Deum semper verum dicere, et necesse est eum nunquam mentiri, non dicitur aliud, nisi quia tanta est in illo constantia servandi veritatem ut necesse sit, nullum rem facere posse, ut verum non dicat, aut ut mentiatur.—Comp. Proslog. 7 :........Inde verius est omnipotens, quia potest nihil per impotentiam et nihil potest contra se. —de concord. præsc. et præd. P. i. c. 2, ss. (where the question is discussed, how far the term necessitas can be applied to God.) Respecting the *knowledge* of God, Anselm (after the example of Augustine) endeavoured to prove, that God does not know the things because they are, but that they are, because he knows them, ibid. c. 7.

(3) However different the theories of Abelard and Anselm were, yet in this one point they agreed. *Abel.* Theol. christ. lib. v. p. 1350, (edit. Martène): Quærendum ita primo videtur, quomodo vere dicatur omnipotens, si non possit omnia efficere, aut quomodo omnia possit, si quædam nos possumus, quæ ipse non possit. Possumus autem quædam, ut ambulare, loqui, sentire, quæ a natura divinitatis penitus aliena sunt, cum necessaria istorum instrumenta nullatenus habere incorporea queat substantia. Quibus quidem objectis id prædicendum arbitror, quod juxta ipsos quoque philosophos, et communis sermonis usum, nunquam potentia cujusque rei accipitur, nisi in his quæ ad commodum vel dignitatem ipsius rei pertinent. Nemo enim hoc potentiæ hominis deputat, quod ille superari facile potest, immo impotentiæ et debilitati ejus quod minime suo resistere potest incommodo, et quicquid ad vitium hominis vergit, magisque personam improbat, quam commendat, impotentiæ potius quam potentiæ adscribendum est......Nemo itaque Deum impotentem in aliquo dicere præsumat, si non possit peccare sicut nos possumus, quia nec in nobis ipsis hoc potentiæ tribuendum est, sed infirmitati......p. 1351 :......Sicut etiam quædam, quæ in aliis rebus potentiæ deputanda sunt, in aliis vero minime ..... Inde potentem hominem comparatione aliorum hominum diceremus, sed non ita leonem vel elephantem. Sic in homine quod ambulare valet potentiæ est adscribendum, quoniam ejus necessitudini congruit, nec in aliquo ejus minuit dignitatem. In Deo vero, qui sola voluntate omnia complet, hoc omnino superfluum esset, quod in nobis necessarium est, atque ideo non potentiæ, sed vitio penitus tribuendum esset in eo, præsertim cum hoc in multis excellentiæ ipsius derogaret, ut ambulare videlicet

posset......Non absurde tamen et de his omnibus quæ efficere possumus Deum potentem prædicabimus, et omnia quæ agimus ejus potentiæ tribuemus, in quo vivimus, movemur et sumus. Et qui omnia operatur in omnibus (utitur enim nobis ad efficiendum quæ vult, quasi instrumentis) et id quoque facere dicitur, quæ nos facere facit, sicut dives aliquis turrem componere per opifices quos adhibet, et posse omnia efficere dicitur, qui sive per se sive per subjectam creaturam omnia quæ vult et quomodo vult, operatur, et ut ita fiant, ipse etiam facit. Nam etsi non potest ambulare, tamen potest facere, ut ambuletur......... *Posse itaque Deus omnia dicitur, non quod omnes suscipere possit actiones, sed quod in omnibus quæ fieri velit, nihil ejus voluntati resistere queat.*[a]

(4) *Hugo of St. Victor*, de sacram. Lib. i. C. 22: Deus omnia potest, et tamen se ipsum destruere non potest. Hoc enim posse, posse non esset, sed non posse. Itaque omnia potest Deus, quæ posse potentia est. Et ideo vere omnipotens est, quia impotens esse non potest. Comp. *Liebner* p. 367. *Peter Lombard*, Sentent. i. Dist. 42. E.: Deus omnino nihil potest pati, et omnia facere potest, præter ea sola quibus dignitas ejus læderetur ejusque excellentiæ derogaretur. In quo tamen non est minus omnipotens: hoc enim posse non est posse, sed non posse. Comp. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 47, 48, where other passages are quoted from the writings of *Richard of St Victor*, de Trin. L. I. c. 21; *Alexander Hales*, Summæ, I. qu. 21. Membr. 1. art. 2; *Albertus Magnus* Summæ P. I. qu. 77. Membr. 1; and *Thomas Aquinas*, Summæ, P. I. qu. 25. art. 3.

(5) *Hugo of St. Victor* (cap. 9. 14—18, quoted by *Liebner*, p. 363, 364.) expressed himself as follows: "All things which were created by God in time, existed uncreated in him from eternity, and were known to him for this very reason, *because* they existed *in* him, and were known to him *in the very manner* in which they existed in him. God knew nothing out of himself, because he comprehended all things in himself. They were not in him, because they should at some future period come into existence; the fact of their being designed to exist in time to come was not the cause of their existence in God, nor were

---

[a] With regard to the Trinity, it may be observed, that Abelard ascribed *omnipotence* principally to the Father, without denying it either to the Son, or to the Spirit.

they created in time because they existed in God, as if the eternal could not have existed without the temporal. On the contrary, the former would have existed without the latter: but it would not have stood in any relation to the latter, if this had not existed as something which was to be in future. There would always have been the knowledge of an existence, viz. of an existence in God, though not of a future existence; but the knowledge of the creator would not therefore have been less comprehensive, because it could only be said that he had no foreknowledge of that which was not future."—In the opinion of *Alexander Hales* God knows all things *through* himself and *in* himself; for if God knew them by means of something else, then the ground of his knowledge would be something perfect existing out of him, and he could not be the most perfect being which owes nothing to any other being......God knows all things at once; for he sees all things in himself, and since he knows himself at once and completely, it is evident that he knows all things in himself at once and perfectly. The things themselves may be multiplied or lessened, but not the knowledge of God; the latter is immutable; see *Cramer*, vii. p. 240.—*Bonaventura*, Comp. i. 29: Scit Deus omnia præsentialiter et simul, perfecte quoque et immutabiliter. Præsentialiter dico, hoc est, ita limpide, ac si cuncta essent præsentialiter existentia. Simul etiam scit omnia, quia videndo se, qui sibi præsens est, omnia videt. Perfecte quoque, quia cognitio ejus nec potest augeri, nec minui. Scit et immutabiliter, quia noscit omnia per naturam sui intellectus, qui est immutabilis. Dicendum ergo, quod Deus cognoscit temporalia æternaliter, mutabilia immutabiliter, contingentia infallibiliter, creata increate, alia vero a se, in se et per se. Comp. Brev. i. 8.—*Thomas Aquinas* quæst. xiv. art. 4: ......In Deo intellectus et id, quod intelligitur, et species intelligibilis et ipsum intelligere sunt omnino unum et idem. Unde patet per hoc, quod Deus dicitur intelligens, nulla multiplicitas ponitur in ejus substantia. Comp. art. 13: Deus autem cognoscit omnia contingentia, non solum prout sunt in suis causis, sed etiam prout unum quodque eorum est actu in se ipso. Et licet contingentia fiant in actu successive, non tamen Deus successive cognoscit contingentia, prout sunt in suo esse, sicut nos, sed simul: quia sua cognitio mensuratur æternitate, sicut etiam suum esse. Æternitas autem tota simul existens audit totum tempus......Unde omnia, quæ sunt in tempore, sunt Deo ab æterno præsentia, non solum ea ratione qua habet rationes rerum apud se præsentes, ut quidam dicunt, sed quia ejus intuitus fertus ab æterno super omnia, prout in sua præsentialitate. Unde manifestum est, quod contingentia et infallibiliter a Deo cognoscuntur, in quantum subduntur divino conspectui secundum suam præsentialitatem, et tamen sunt futura contingentia suis causis comparata......Ea, quæ temporaliter in actum reducenter, a nobis successive cognoscuntur in tempore, sed a Deo in æternitati, quæ est supra tempus. Sicut ille, qui vadit per viam, non videt illos, qui post eum veniant, sed ille, qui ab aliqua altitudine totam vitam intuetur, simul videt omnes transeuntes per viam. On the relation between knowledge and foreknowledge, see *John of Salisbury*, Policrat. ii. 21. (Bibl. max. xxiii. p. 268.) An instance of subtile reasoning is given by *Liebner*, l. c. p. 365, note.

(6) *Abelard*, Theol. christ. v. p. 1354:......Facit itaque omnia quæ potest Deus, et tantum bene quantum potest......Necesse est, ut omnia quæ vult, ipse velit; sed nec inefficax ejus voluntas esse potest: necesse est ergo ut quæcunque vult ipse perficiat, cum eam videlicet sumamus voluntatem, quæ ad ipsius pertinet ordinationem. Istis ergo rationibus astruendum videtur, quod plura Deus nullatenus facere possit quam faciat, aut melius facere, aut ab his cessare, sed omnia ita ut facit necessario facere. Sed rursus singulis istis difficillimæ occurrunt objectiones, ut utroque cornu graviter fidem nostram oppugnet complexio. Quis enim negare audeat, quod non possit Deus eum qui damnandus est solvere aut meliorem illum qui salvandus est facere, quam ipse futurus sit collatione suorum donorum, aut omnino dimisisse ne eum unquam crearet? Quippe si non potest Deus hunc salvare, utique nec ipse salvari a Deo potest. Necessaria quippe est hæc reciprocationis consecutio, quod si ipse salvatur a Deo, Deus hunc salvat. Unde si possibile est hunc salvari a Deo, possibile est Deum hunc salvare. Non enim possibile est antecedens, nisi possibile sit et consequens: alioquin ex possibili impossibile sequeretur, quod omnino falsum est. ... Comp. the subsequent part of the chapter. Nevertheless he comes to the following conclusion: quicquid itaque facit (Deus) sicut necessario vult, ita et necessario facit.

(7) On the opposition of Hugo of St Victor against the optimism of Abelard (who found himself compelled to suppose a higher degree of the Divine power, than of the Divine will) comp. *Liebner* p. 367, 368.

§ 168.

C. MORAL ATTRIBUTES.

The *moral attributes* of God, viz. his wisdom, justice, and benevolence, were, in connection with other doctrines, sometimes treated of in such a manner as to make men believe, that they were contradictory to each other.(1) As the knowledge of God is one with his being, so likewise his volition, whose final object is nothing but the absolutely good, that is God.(2) The mystics preferred descending into the depth of Divine love, and endeavoured to explain it in their own way,(3) while the scholastics advanced absurd questions even respecting this attribute of God, which admits least of all of being dialectically discussed.(4)

---

(1) This was the case with the justice, omnipotence, and love of God in reference to the theory of satisfaction. Comp. *Anselm,* Cur Deus homo i. c. 6—12, and the preceding §, note 1.

(2) *Thomas Aquinas,* summa P. I. Qu. 19. art. 13: Voluntas divina accessariam habitudinem habet ad bonitatem suam, quæ est propriam ejus objectum. The question was raised, whether God has a liberum arbitrium, whereas everything is necessary in him. Thomas decided that God is free respecting that which is not an essential attribute of his nature, that is, respecting the accidental, finite. But respecting himself he is determined by his own necessity, comp. art. 10, and *Baur,* Trinitätslehre, ii. p. 641.—*Duns Scotus,* on the contrary, asserts the absolute liberty of God.

(3) The language of the author of the "Deutsche Theologie" is worthy of notice (c. 50): "God does not love himself as such, but as the most perfect being. For if God knew anything better than God, he would love it, and not himself. Self-love and self-will are entirely foreign to God; only so much belongs to God, as is necessary to constitute his personality, or the distinction between the different persons of the Trinity."

(4) Thus *Alexander Hales* asked (the passage is quoted by

Cramer, vii. p. 231), whether the love wherewith God loves his creatures is the same with that which he manifests towards himself, and the Divine persons manifest towards each other? He replies in the affirmative in reference to the principal idea, (principale signatum), but in the negative respecting the secondary idea (connatum), *i. e.* that love is the same on the part of him who loves, but not the same with regard to those who are loved. It is also on that account that God does not manifest the same degree of love towards all his creatures, but more of it towards the better portion of them, less towards the less good. He loves all creatures from eternity (in the idea), but he does not love them in reality, until they come into existence. Another question was: whom does God love most, the angels or men? The answer is: the former, inasmuch as Christ did not belong to the number of the latter; but the love wherewith God loves Christ, and consequently the human race *in* Christ, even surpasses the love which he manifests towards the angels. We have here a profound Christian truth expressed in a scholastic form.

§ 169.

PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

Walch, J. G., historia controversiæ, etc. *Pfaff*, historia succincta (comp. § 94.)

Before the doctrine of the Trinity could be more philosophically developed and fully established, it was necessary to settle the controversy which had arisen between the Eastern and the Western Church respecting the procession of the Holy Ghost from both the Father and the Son. After the view taken by the Greek church had been received in the East as the orthodox doctrine, in consequence of the efforts made by *John Damascenus*, (1) the Emperor Charlemagne summoned a synod at Aix la Chapelle in the year 809, which being influenced especially by the Gallican theologians *Alcuin* and *Theodulph of Orleans*, confirmed the doctrine of the western church, according to which the Holy Ghost proceeds not only from the Father, but also from the Son.(2) Pope Leo III. approved of the doctrine itself, but disapproved of the uncritical introduction of the clause "filioque" into the creed adopted by the council of Constantinople. He numbered the doctrine in question among those mysteries which pass knowledge, and are of greater importance in a speculative point of view, than in a practical aspect.(3) But when in later times the controversy between *Photius*, patriarch of Constantinople, and *Nicholas I.* led to a disruption between the two churches, their difference on the said doctrine was again made the subject of discussion. Photius defended the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, and rejected the additional clause "filioque," which the theologians of the western church, such as *Æneas,* bishop of Paris, and *Ratramnus,* a monk of Corvey, were desirous to retain.(4) *Anselm,* archbishop of Canterbury, likewise defended the doctrine of the Latin church at the synod of Bari (in Apulia) in the year 1098, and treated of it more fully in a separate treatise.(5) The attempt made at the synod of Lyons in the year 1274, to reconcile the two parties, did not lead to any satisfactory result. The controversy was resumed in the year 1277; nor did the formula proposed at the synod of Florence (A. D. 1439,) settle the point in question.(6) Hence it happened that from that time the two churches ever differed in this, that according to the Greek church the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, but according to the Latin church from both the Father and the Son. There were, however, some theologians in the latter who adopted the view taken by the Greek divines.(7)

(1) De fide orth. i. c. 7. He called the Holy Ghost (in distinction from a mere breath, or a mere Divine power) δύναμιν οὐσιώδη, αὐτὴν ἑαυτῆς ἐν ἰδιαζούσῃ ὑποστάσει θεωρουμένην, καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς προερχομένην, but added: καὶ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἀναπαυομένην καὶ αὐτοῦ οὖσαν ἐκφαντικὴν, οὔτε χωρισθῆναι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἐστι καὶ τοῦ λόγου, ᾧ συμπαρομαρτεῖ, δυναμένην,

οὔτε πρὸς τὸ ἀνύπαρκτον ἀναχεομένην, ἀλλὰ καθ' ὁμοιότητα τοῦ λόγου καθ' ὑπόστασιν οὖσαν, ζῶσαν, προαιρετικὴν, αὐτοκίνητον, ἐνεργὸν, πάντοτε τὸ ἀγαθὸν θέλουσαν, καὶ πρὸς πᾶσαν πρόθεσιν σύνδρομον ἔχουσαν τῇ βουλήσει τὴν δύναμιν, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἔχουσαν, μήτε τέλος· οὐ γὰρ ἐνέλειψέ ποτε τῷ πατρὶ λόγος, οὔτε τῷ λόγῳ πνεῦμα.

(2) *Alcuinus*, de processione Spir. S. libellus. Opp. T. i. ed. *Froben*, p. 743.—In support of his views he appealed to Luke vi. 19. (Omnis turba quærebat eum tangere, quia virtus de illo exibat et sanabat omnes); to John xx. 21, 22; 1 John iii. 23, 24, and to the authority of the Fathers. *Theodulphi* de Spiritu S. liber, in Theodulphi Opp. ed. *Sirmond*. Par. 1646. 8, and in Sirmondii Opp. T. ii. p. 1695, cf. Libr. Carolin. Lib. iii. c. 3: Ex patre et filio—omnis universaliter confitetur ecclesia eum procedere. Concerning the historical part, see other works on ecclesiastical history. [*Gieseler*, ii. § 12, § 93, § 156.]

(3 On the occasion of a controversy between the Greek and Latin Monks at Jerusalem prior to the Synod of Aix la Chapelle, the Pope had given it as his opinion: Spiritum Sanctum a Patre et Filio æqualiter procedentem.—Respecting the relation in which he stood to the synod itself, see Collatio cum Papa Romæ a legatis habita et Epist. Caroli Imperat. ad Leonem P. iii. utraque a Smaragdo Abb. edita in *Mansi*, T. xiv. p. 17, ss.

(4) See *Photii* Epist. encyclica issued A. D. 867, (given by *Montacucius*, Ep. 2, p. 47); the following, among other charges, is there brought forward against the Roman church: Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μόνον, ἀλλά γε ἐκ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐκπορεύεσθαι καινολογήσαντες. The writings of his opponents *Ratramus* and *Æneas* are no longer extant in a complete form, comp. *d'Achery*, Spicil. Ed. i. T. i. p. 63, ss. *Rössler*, Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, vol. x. p. 663, ss. [They rested their view upon Gal. iv. 6; Phil. i. 19; Acts ii. 33; xvi. 7. John viii. 42; xx. 22.]

(5) Concerning the synod, see *Eadmer*, Vita Anselmi, p. 21, quoted by *Walch* l. c. p. 61. The work of *Anselm* is entitled: de processione Spiritus S. contra Græcos, Opp. p. 49, (Edit. Lugd. p. 115.) In chapters 1—3 he shows in a clear and concise manner the points of *agreement* between the two churches (in reference to the doctrine of the Trinity, and that of the Holy Spirit in its general aspects), as well as the points of *difference*. Respecting the doctrine of the western church itself, Anselm argued from the proposition: Deus est de Deo, as follows (c. 4): Cum est de patre Spir. S., non potest non esse de

filio, si non est filius de Spiritu Sancto; nulla enim alia ratione potest negari Spiritus S. esse de filio......Quod autem filius non sit de Spir. S. palam est ex catholica fide; non enim est Deus de Deo, nisi aut nascendo ut filius, aut procendo ut Spir. S. Filius autem non nascitur de Spiritu S. Si enim nascitur de illo, est filius Spir. Sancti, et Spiritus S. pater ejus, sed alter alterius nec pater nec filius. Non ergo nascitur de Spiritu S. filius, nec minus apertum est, quia non procedit de illo. Esset enim Spir. ejusdem Spiritus Sancti, quod aperte negatur, cum Spiritus S. dicitur et creditur Spiritus Filii. Non enim potest esse Spiritus sui Spiritus. Quare non procedit filius de Spir. Sancto. Nullo ergo modo est de Spir. Sancto filius. Sequitur itaque inexpugnabili ratione, Spir. Sanctum esse de filio, sicut est de patre.—C. 7: Nulla relatio est patris sine relatione filii, sicut nihil est filii relatio, sine patris relatione. Si ergo alia nihil est sine altera, non potest aliquid de relatione patris esse sine relatione filii. Quare sequitur. Spiritum S. esse de utraque, si est de una. Itaque si est de patre secundum relationem, erit simul et de filio secundum eundem sensum......Non autem magis est pater Deus quam filius, sed unus solus verus Deus, Pater et Filius. Quapropter si Spiritus S. est de Patre, quia est de Deo qui pater est, negari nequit esse quoque de Filio, cum sit de Deo, qui est Filius.—(C. 8–12, he gives the scriptural argument.) In the thirteenth chapter he meets the objection, that the doctrine in question would lower the dignity of the Spirit......Qui dicimus Spiritum S. de filio esse sive procedere, nec minorem, nec posteriorem eum filio fatemur, namque quamvis splendor et calor de sole procedant, nec possint esse nisi sit ille, de quo sunt, nihil tamen prius aut posterius in tribus, in sole et splendore et calore intelligimus, multo itaque minus, cum hæc in rebus temporalibus ita sint, in æternitate, quæ tempore non clauditur, prædictæ tres personæ in existendo susceptibiles intervalli possunt intelligi.—The concession made by the Greek theologians, viz. Spiritum Sanct. de patre esse *per* filium, did not appear satisfactory to Anselm. As a lake is formed not only by the spring, but also by the river which flows from the spring, so the Spirit proceeds both from the Father and the Son.[a] (C. 15

---

[a] A similar illustration is adduced by *Abelard*, theol. chr. iv. p. 1335; Spir. Sanct. ex patre proprie procedere dicitur, quasi a summa origine, quæ scilicet aliunde non sit, et ab ipso in filium quasi in rivum . . . . et per filium ad nos tandem quasi in stagnum hujus seculi.

and 16.) We must not, however, assume the existence of *two* principles from which the Spirit might be supposed to proceed but only *one* Divine principle, including both the Father and the Son (c. 17.) In chapters 18–20, he considers those scriptures which apparently teach the procession of the Spirit from the Father alone; c. 21, he defends the introduction of the clause "filioque" as a necessary measure to prevent any misunderstanding. In chapters 22–27, he repeats and confirms all he has said before. Anselm commenced his treatise by invoking the aid of the Holy Spirit himself, he concluded it by saying: Si autem aliquid protuli quod aliquatenus corrigendum sit, *mihi* imputetur, non *sensui* Latinitatis.—Concerning the progress of the controversy, comp. *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 112, 113.

(6) At the synod of Lyons the Greeks agreed with the council in adopting as Can. I.: Quod Spir. S. æternabiliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ex uno principio, non duabas spirationibus, sed unica spiratione procedit.—But new differences arose, respecting which see the works on ecclesiastical history, and compare *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, l. c. p. 114. In the formula of union framed by the synod of Florence, A. D. 1439, July 6th, (given by *Mansi*, T. xxi. p. 1027, ss. and *Gieseler*, ii. 4, § 156, *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 115,) use was made of the expression, quod Spirit. S. ex Patre et Filio æternaliter est; the phrase: procedere ex Patre *per* filium, was interpreted in accordance with the views of the Latin church, and the clause *filioque* was retained. But the peace thus established did not last long, and the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, issued (A. D. 1443) a letter against the union. Comp. *Leo Allatius* de ecclesiæ occidentalis et orientalis perpetua consensione, p. 939, ss. For the other works see *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, and *Gieseler*, l. c.

(7) Thus *John Wessel,* comp *Ullmann,* die Reformatoren, etc. i. p. 388, 94.

§ 170.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

The doctrine of the Trinity, which had been developed in the preceding period, and, to a certain extent, received its final shape by John Damascenus,(1) presented an inducement to the speculative tendency and ingenuity of the scholastics, as well as to the imagination of the mystics, to fathom the unsearchable depth of that mystery. But all dialectic attempts were accompanied by the former danger of falling into heretical errors either in the one or the other direction. This was especially the case with scholasticism in its earlier stage. The notion of *John Scotus Erigena*, that the terms Father and Son are mere names, to which there is no corresponding objective distinction of essence in the Godhead, strongly savours of Pantheism.(2) The daring assertions of *Roscellinus* exposed him to the charge of Tritheism,(3) while those of *Abelard* exposed him to that of Sabellianism.(4) The distinction which *Gilbert of Poitiers* drew between the *quo est* and the *quod est* gave to his doctrine the semblance of Tetratheism.(5) *Anselm*,(6) and *Peter Lombard*,(7) adopted the views held by Augustine on this point; the terminology, however, used by the latter gave rise to misunderstandings. The treatment applied by the scholastics of the second period to the subject in question was more strictly systematical and speculative.(8) But this very tendency, which more and more lost sight of the practical aspect of the doctrine, led to those subtile distinctions and absurd questions which for a long time seriously injured the reputation of scholasticism.(9) Among the Greeks, *Nicetas Choniates* contented himself with representing the mystery in question in figurative language,(10) while *Nicholas of Methone* manifested a stronger leaning to the dialectic tendency of the western theologians.(11) The mystics followed for the most part *Dionysius Areopagita*, and were at much pains either to represent the incomprehensible in their writings as incomprehensible,(12) or to bring it more within the reach of our apprehension (in doing which they did not always avoid the appearance of pantheism.)(13)—The disciples of the school of

St Victor, held, as it were, the medium between sterile scholasticism and fantastic mysticism.(14) *Savonarola*,(15) and *Wessel*,(16) instead of indulging in philosophical reasonings, based upon the nature of God, returned to natural and human analogies, which served only for the purpose of illustrating the said mystery, but were not meant to explain it.

(1) *John Damascenus* brings forward nothing new. He repeats the earlier doctrines by making use of the common illustrations derived from νοῦς and λόγος, and the comparison with the human word and spirit employed by former theologians. God cannot be ἄλογος, but the Logos must have a πνεῦμα. He lays great stress upon the unity in the Trinity, so that the Son and the Spirit, though being persons, have yet their unity in the Father; what they are, they are by him. He has therefore been charged with a want of decision between Unitarianism and Tritheism. Comp. *Baur*, Trinitätslehre, ii. p. 176, ss. *Meier*, p. 199, ss.

(2) De div. nat. i. 18: Num quid veris ratiocinationibus obsistit, si dicamus, Patrem et Filium ipsius habitudinis, quæ dicitur ad aliquid, nomina esse et plus quam habitudinis? Non enim credendum est, eandem esse habitudinem in excellentissimis divinæ essentiæ substantiis, et in his, quæ post eam ab ea condita sunt. Quemadmodum superat omnem essentiam, sapientiam, virtutem, ita etiam habitudinem omnino ineffabiliter supergreditur. According to i. 14, Scotus (appealing to earlier Theologians and Inquisitores veritatis) calls the Father the essentia, the Son the sapientia, and the Spirit the vita Dei. On the question respecting the relation between the four categories of nature, creans, etc. (see § 265,) and the three persons of the Trinity, comp. *Baur*, Trinitätslehre, ii. p. 275. ss. *Meier*, p. 230, ss.

(3) In accordance with his nominalistic notions *Roscellinus* regarded the appellation *God*, which is common to the three persons, as a mere name, *i. e.* as the abstract idea of a genus, under which the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* are comprehended (as three individuals, as it were.) This was at least the meaning which his opponents attached to his language; see Ep. *Joannis Monachi* ad Anselmum (given by *Baluze*, Miscell. L. iv. p. 478):

Hanc de tribus Deitatis personis quæstionem Roscelinus movet: Si tres personæ sunt una tantum res, et non sunt tres res per se, sicut tres angeli aut tres animæ, ita tamen ut voluntate et potentia omnino sint idem: ergo Pater et Spir. S. cum filio incarnatus est.—This opinion was condemned by the synod of Soissons (A. D. 1093), and combated by *Anselm* in his treatise: de fide trinitatis et de incarnatione verbi contra blasphemias Rucelini.—But Anselm doubted the accuracy of the statements made by his opponents, c. 3: Sed forsitan ipse non dicit: "sicut sunt tres animæ aut tres angeli;" he thought it more probable that Roscelinus had expressed himself in more general terms: Tres personas esse tres, sine additamento alicujus similitudinis, and that the above illustration was added by his opponents. Nevertheless he was disposed to attach credit to the most absurd statements of his opponents! comp. c. 2.[a] Comp. *Baur*, Trinitätslehre, ii. p. 400, ss.

(4) Concerning the history of *Abelard's* condemnation at the synod of Soissons (Concilium Suessionense, A. D. 1121,) comp. the works on ecclesiastical history, and Neander, der heilige Bernhard, p. 121, ss. His views are principally contained in his Introduction ad Theologiam and in Theologia Christiana. He proceeds from the absolute perfection of God. If God is the absolutely perfect being, he must also be absolutely powerful, wise, and good. Power, wisdom, and love are therefore, in his opinion, the three persons of the Trinity, and the difference is merely nominal. Theol. Christiana I. 1. p. 1156, ss.: Summi boni perfectionem, quod Deus est, ipsa Dei sapientia incarnata. Christus Dominus describendo tribus *nominibus* diligenter distinxit, cum unicam et singularum individuam penitus ac simplicem substantiam divinam, Patrem et Filium et Spirit. S. tribus de causis appellavit: Patrem quidem secundum illum unicam majestatis suæ potentiam, quæ est omnipotentia, quia scilicet efficere potest, quidquid vult, cum nihil ei resistere queat; Filium au-

---

[a] At a later period *Jerome of Prague* was charged with *Tetratheism*, and even with more than that. He is said to have taught: In Deo sive in divina essentia non solum est Trinitas personarum, sed etiam *quaternitas* rerum et *quinternitas*, etc. Istæ res in divinis sunt sic distinctæ, quod una non est alia, et tamen quælibet earum est Deus. Istarum rerum una est aliis perfectior. See *Hermann von der Hardt*, Acta et decretalia, T. iv. p. viii. ss. p. 645.

tem eandem Divinam substantiam dixit secundum propriæ sapientiæ discretionem, qua videlicet cuncta dijudicare ac discernere potest, ut nihil eam latere possit, quo decipiatur; Spiritum S. etiam vocavit ipsam, secundum illam benignitatis suæ gratiam, qua omnia, quæ summa condidit sapientia, summa ordinat bonitate et ad optimum quæque finem accommodat, malo quoque bene semper utens et mirabiliter quantamlibet perverse facta optime disponens, quasi qui utraque manu pro dextra utatur et nesciat nisi dextram....Tale est ergo tres personas hoc est Patrem et Filiam et Spirit. S. in divinitate confiteri, ac si commemoraremus divinam potentiam generantem, divinum sapientiam genitam, divinam benignitatem procedentem. Ut his videlicet tribus commemoratis summi boni perfectio prædicetur, cum videlicet ipse Deus et summæ potens, *i. e.* omnipotens, et summe sapiens et summe benignus ostenditur. Comp. Introd. ad Theol. I. 10. p. 991, and the other passages quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 53, 54.—The relation in which the Father stands to the Son and Spirit, Abelard compares to that in which matter stands to form (materia et materiatum.) As a wax figure is composed of wax, but, being a distinctly shaped figure, differs from the unshapen mass, so the Son being materia materiata, differs from the Father. The latter, however, remains the materia ipsa, nor could it be said with the same propriety, that the wax owes its origin to the figure, as it can be said, that the figure owes its origin to the wax. He also compares the Trinity to a brass seal, and draws a distinction between the substance of what the seal (æs) is composed, the figure carved in the brass (sigillabile), and the seal itself (sigillans), inasmuch as it manifests its existence by the act of sealing.—The comparison which Abelard drew (Introd. ii. 12.) between the three persons of the Trinity, and the three persons in grammar (prima quæ loquitur, secunda, ad quam loquitur, tertia, de qua loquuntur) was particularly offensive, and might easily be represented as countenancing Tritheism.

(5) The heterodox opinions of *Gilbert* also were connected with the controversy between Nominalism and Realism; he proceeded from Realism, but at last arrived at the same results to which Roscellinus had been led by Nominalism. According to the statements made by him in Paris 1147, and in Rheims 1148, in the presence of Eugenius III., he asserted: divinam essentiam non esse Deum. The former is the form by which God is God,

but it is not God himself, as humanity is the form of man, but not man himself. The Father, the Son, and the Spirit are *one;* but not in reference to the quod est, but only in reference to the quo est, i. e. (the substantial form.) We can therefore say: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost *are* one; but not: God *is* Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Gilbert considered the error of Sabellius to have consisted in this, that he confounded the quo est with the quod est. He himself was charged with making distinctions in the manner of Arius. There was indeed the semblance of Tritheism in his proposition: that which makes the three persons to be three, are tria singularia quædam, tres res numerabiles. The distinction which he drew between the quod est, the divine essence as such, and the three persons, brought upon him the further charge of believing in a quaternitas. Gilbert was not formally condemned, but Eugenius III. declared, that in theology, God and the Godhead could not be separated from one another. Comp. especially *Gaufredi*, Abbatis Clarævallensis, epistola ad Albinum Card. et episc. Albanens. (*Mansi* T. xxi. p. 728, ss) and his Libellus contra capitula Gilberti Pictav. episcop. in *Mabillon's* edition of Bernard's works. T. II. p. 1336. ss.

(6) The view which *Anselm* took of the doctrine of the Trinity, was on the whole not much sounder than that of Abelard. He almost seems to lose sight not only of the real, but also of the nominal distinction between the divine persons, though he asserts it. His opinion does not much differ from that of Augustine. *He* too looked upon the Son as the wisdom of God, and upon the Holy Ghost as the love of God. Comp. Monol. c 27, ss. C. 30, he says of the Son (the Word): Si mens humana nullam ejus aut sui habere memoriam aut intelligentiam posset, nequaquam se ab irrationabilibus creaturis, et illam ab omni creatura, secum sola tacite disputando sicut nunc mens mea facit, discerneret. Ergo summus ille spiritus, sicut est æternus, ita æterno sui memor est, et intelligit se ad similitudinem mentis rationalis: immo non ad ullius similitudinem, sed ille principaliter, et mens rationalis ad ejus similitudinem. At si æterne se intelligit, æterne se dicit. Si æterne se dicit, æterne est verbum ejus apud ipsum. Sive igitur ille cogitetur nulla alia existente essentia, sive aliis existentibus, necesse est, verbum illius coæternum illi esse cum ipso……C. 36: Sicut igitur ille creator est rerum et principium, sic et verbum ejus; nec tamen sunt duo, sed unus creator et unum principium…C. 37: Quamvis

enim necessitas cogat, ut sint duo: nullo tamen modo exprimi potest, quid duo sint......C. 38: Etenim proprium unius est, esse ex altero et proprium est alterius, alterum esse ex illo. C. 39:......Illius est verissimum proprium esse parentem, istius vero veracissimam esse prolem. C. 42:......Sic sunt (pater et filius) *oppositi relationibus*, ut alter nunquam suscipiat proprium alterius: sicut sunt *concordes natura*, ut alter semper teneat essentiam alterius. C. 43: . . . . Est autem perfecte summa essentia pater et perfecte summa essentia filius, pariter ergo perfectus pater per se est, et pariter perfectus filius per se est, sicut uterque sapit per se. Non enim idcirco minus perfecta est essentia vel sapientia filius, quia est essentia nata de patris essentia, et sapientia de sapientia: sed tunc minus perfecta essentia vel sapientia esset, si non esset per se, aut non saperet per se. Nequaquam enim repugnat, ut filius per se subsistat, et de patre habeat esse.—Nevertheless he speaks of a priority of the Father, c. 44: Valde tamen magis congruit filium dici essentiam patris, quam patrem essentiam filii; quoniam namque pater a nullo habet essentiam nisi a se ipso, non satis apte dicitur habere essentiam alicujus nisi suam: quia vero filius essentiam suam habet a patre, et eandem habet pater, aptissime dici potest, habere essentiam patris.—C. 45: Veritas quoque patris aptissime dici potest filius, non solum eo sensu, quia est eadem filii veritas quæ est et patris, sicut jam perspectum est, sed etiam hoc sensu, ut in eo intelligatur non imperfecta quædam imitatio, sed integra veritas paternæ substantiæ, quia non est aliud, quam quod est pater. At si ipsa substantia patris est intelligentia et scientia et sapientia et veritas, consequenter colligitur: quia sicut filius est intelligentia et scientia et sapientia et veritas paternæ substantiæ, ita est intelligentia intelligentiæ, scientia scientiæ, sapientia sapientiæ et veritas veritatis. . . . . . C. 47: Est igitur filius memoria patris et memoria memoriæ, *i. e.* memoria memor patris, qui est memoria, sicut est sapientia patris et sapientia sapientiæ, *i. e.* sapientia sapiens patrem sapientiam, et filius quidem memoria nata de memoria, sicut sapientia nata de sapientia, pater vero de nullo nata memoria vel sapientia.—C. 48. Concerning the *Spirit* he expresses himself as follows: Palam certe est rationem habenti, eum idcirco sui memorem esse, aut se intelligere, quia se amat, sed ideo se amare, quia sui meminit et se intelligit: nec eum se posse amare, si sui non sit memor aut se non in-

telligit. Nulla enim res amatur, sine ejus memoria et intelligentia, et multa tenentur memoria et intelliguntur, quæ non amantur. Patet igitur amorem summi spiritus ex eo procedere, quia sui memor est et se intelligit. Quod si in memoria summi spiritus intelligitur pater, in intelligentia filius, manifestum est: quia a patre pariter et a filio summi spiritus amor procedit. C. 49: Sed si se amat summus spiritus, procul dubio se amat pater, amat se filius et alter alterum: quia singulus pater summus est spiritus, et singulus filius summus spiritus, et ambo simul unus spiritus. Et quia uterque pariter sui et alterius meminit, et se et alterum intelligit, et quoniam omnino id ipsum est quod amat vel amatur in patre et quod in filio, necesse est ut pari amore uterque diligat se et alterum.—C. 55. Respecting *the relation in which the three persons stand to each other*, he says: Patrem itaque nullus facit sive creat aut gignit, filium vero pater solus gignit, sed non facit; pater autem pariter et filius non faciunt neque gignunt, sed quodammodo si sic dici potest, spirant suum amorem: quamvis enim non nostro more spiret summa incommutabilis essentia, tamen ipsum amorem a se ineffabiliter procedentem, non discedendo ab illa, sed existendo ex illa, forsitan non alio modo videtur posse dici aptius ex se emittere quam spirando. C. 57: Jocundum est intueri in patre et filio et utriusque spiritu, quomodo sint in se invicem tanta æqua æqualitate, ut nullus alium excedat. . . . . Totam quippe suam memoriam summus intelligit spiritus[a] et amat et totius intelligentiæ meminit et totam amat et totius amoris meminit et totum intelligit. Intelligitur autem in memoria pater, in intelligentia filius, in amore utriusque spiritus. Tanta igitur pater et filius et utriusque spiritus æqualitate sese complectuntur et sunt in se invicem, ut eorum nullus alium excedere, aut sine eo esse probetur. . . . . C. 60: . . . Est enim unusquisque non minus in aliis quam in se ipso. . . . (It should be observed that Anselm admitted that this relation can neither be comprehended, nor expressed in suitable words, c. 62.)

(7) Sentent. Lib. i. Dist. 5, (quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln ii. p. 56, 57,) and dist. 25. K: Alius est in persona vel personaliter pater, *i. e.* proprietate sua pater alius est quam filius, et filius proprietate sua alius, quam pater. Paternali enim

---

[a] The word spiritus is also used through the whole treatise in reference to the Godhead generally speaking.

proprietate distinguitur hypostasis patris ab hypostasi filii, et hypostasis filii filiali proprietate discernitur a patre, et Spir. S. ab utroque processibili proprietate distinguitur. Comp. *Baur*, Trinitätslehre ii. p. 550. *Joachim*, abbot of Flore, opposed Peter Lombard, and charged him with having taught: Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanct. quandam summam esse rem, quæ neque sit generans, neque genita, neque procedens. But Peter Lombard had only urged the importance of the distinction often neglected between *God* (as such) and God the Father (as one of the persons of the Trinity,) and had therefore asserted: Non est dicendum, quod divina essentia genuit filium, quia cum filius sit divina essentia, jam esset filius res, a qua generaretur: et ita eadem res se ipsam generaret......quod omnino esse non potest. Sed pater solus genuit filium, et a patre et filio procedit spiritus S. (On the doctrine of Joachim himself, see note 13.)

(8) *Alexander Hales* Summæ P. i. Q. 42, Membr. 2, quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 55. *Cramer*, vol. vii. p. 309, ss. *Thomas Aquinas* P. i. Qu. 27–43. We meet with a purely speculative perception of the Trinity in the work of *Alanus ab Ins.* i. art. 25. Pez, i. p. 484; he regarded the Father as *matter*, the Son as *form*, and the Holy Spirit as the *union of both*. Comp. *Alexander Hales*, quoted by Cramer, l. c. The generation of the Son is explained by the diffusive nature of God; at the same time, a distinction is made between *material* generation (from the substance of the Father,) *original* generation (as a human son is begotten by his father.) and *ordinal* generation (as the morning gives rise to noon;) but none of these can be applied to the Divine being. It is only in so far admissible to speak of the Son being begotten from the substance of the Father, as such language is not meant to imply anything material, but only intended to teach, that the nature of the Son does not differ from that of the Father.

(9) Questions such as the following were started: Was it *necessary* that God should beget, or might he have possessed the *power*, but not the *will* to beget? why are there just *three* persons in the Trinity? why not more or less? how does it happen that the name of the Father is put *first*, and the names of the Son and Spirit follow, though all three are equal? is it allowed to invert the order, and why not? etc. *Anselm* (Monol. c. 40.) inquired into the reason for calling God Father, in reference to the act of generation, and not mother. He also de-

monstrated very seriously, that the Son was the fittest of the three persons of the Trinity to become man: Cur Deus homo ii. 9: Si quælibet alia persona incarnetur, erunt duo filii in Trinitate, filius scilicet Dei, qui et ante incarnationem filius est, et ille qui per incarnationem filius erit virginis: et erit in personis, quæ semper æquales esse debent, inæqualitas secundum dignitatem nativitatum......Item, si Pater fuerit incarnatus, erunt duo nepotes in Trinitate, quia Pater erit nepos parentum virginis per hominem assumtum, et Verbum, cum nihil habeat de homine, nepos tamen erit virginis, quia filii ejus erit filius, quæ omnia inconvenientia sunt, nec in incarnatione Verbi contingunt. Est et aliud, cur magis conveniat incarnari filio, quam aliis personis, quia convenientius sonat filium supplicare Patri, quam aliam personam alii. Item, homo, pro quo erat oraturus, diabolus, quem erat expugnaturus, ambo falsam similitudinem Dei per propriam voluntatem præsumserant. Unde quasi specialius adversus personam Filii peccaverunt, qui vera Patris similitudo creditur, etc. (Comp. below § 179.)

(10) One of his illustrations is *e. g.* taken from a balance (Thesaur. c. 30.) The Son represents the central point of union between the Father and the Holy Spirit, and preserves the most perfect equilibrium between the two; but the whole denotes the perfect equilibrium between honour, power, and being, the inner Divine equality and harmony, inasmuch as no person elevates himself above the other. The double-winged seraphim also are in his opinion a figure of the Trinity. But while in the former case the *Son* is to be regarded as the central-point of union, in the latter the body of the seraphim represents the *Father*, and the wings denote the *Son* and the *Holy Spirit*. Comp. *Ullmann*, l. c. p. 41, 42.

(11) "*Many of the earlier theologians asserted the incomprehensibility of God, and at the same time propounded the most profound mysteries of the doctrine of the Trinity with a degree of assurance which would allow of no doubt, and Nicholas was guilty of the same inconsistency. In the same sentence he represented the nature of God as beyond knowledge and expression, beyond the apprehension and investigation even of the highest order of spirits, and gave the most precise and apodictical definitions concerning the relation subsisting between the Divine being and the Divine persons*" (*e. g.* Refut. p. 23, 24.) *Ullmann*, p. 78. *Nicholas* removed the apparent con-

tradiction of a trinity in a unity by avoiding all analogies with created objects. He would not have understood the terms: unity and trinity in the sense in which theyare used by mathematicians, viz. as *numeric* definitions. But in his opinion the unity of God was only a unity of being, and the trinity a trinity of *persons.* He thought that there was nothing contradictory in the union of *such* a unity with *such* a trinity, see *Ullmann*, p. 79, 80. (He also appealed to Gregory of Nazianzum Orat. xxix. 2: Μονὰς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς δυάδα κινηθεῖσα, μέχρι τριάδος ἔστη.) "We adore," said Nicholas (Refut. p. 67.), "as the creative principle of all existence that God who is one as respects his essential nature, but consists of three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. With regard to these three, we praise the Father as *that which causes* (ὡς αἴτιον), but we confess that the Son, and the Holy Spirit have proceeded from the Father as *that which is caused* (ὡς αἰτιατά.) They are not created nor brought forth in the common sense of the word, but in a supernatural, superhuman manner. Being of the same essence, they are united with the Father and with each other without being confounded; they are distinct without separation." Regarding the term αἴτιον he would not have it understood to denote a *creative* or formative causality, but a *hypostatic* one, which might be called γεννητικόν (*i. e.* that which causes *generation*) in relation to the Son, and προακτικὸν εἴτουν προβλητικόν (*i. e.* that which causes *procession*) in reference to the Spirit. Thus he also said (p. 45): ὁ πατὴρ ἓν πνεῦμα προβάλλει; see *Ullmann*, l. c. p. 82.

(12) *Tauler* (Predigten ii. p. 172.) said: "Concerning this most excellent and holy Trinity, we cannot find any suitable words in which we might speak of it, and yet we must express this supernatural incomprehensible Trinity in words. If we therefore attempt to speak of it, it is as impossible to do it properly, as to reach the sky with one's head. For all that we can say or think of it, is a thousand times less proportionate to it, than the point of a needle is to heaven and earth, yea a hundred thousand times less. We might talk to a wonderful amount, and yet we could neither express nor understand, how the distinction of the persons can exist in the supernatural unity. It is better to meditate on these things than to speak of them; for it is not very pleasant either to say much about this matter, or to hear of it, especially when words have been introduced (from without), and because we are altogether unequal to the

task. For the whole subject is at an infinite distance from us, and wholly foreign to us, nor is it revealed to us, for it even surpasses the apprehension of angels. We therefore leave it to great prelates and learned men; they must have something to say, in order to defend the catholic faith; but we will simply believe."

(10 In opposition to Peter Lombard, *Joachim*, Abbot of Flore, laid down a theory which was condemned by the fourth council of the Lateran (A. D. 1215), though he pretended to have received it by inspiration. He looked upon the instrument of ten strings as the best image of the Trinity. Its three corners represent the three persons, the instrument itself denotes the unity. Concerning the further developement of this notion see *Engelhardt*, Kirchenhistorische Abhandlungen, p. 265, ss.—The views of *Master Eckart* on the doctrine of the Trinity are given by *Schmidt* in the Studien und Kritiken, l. c. p. 694. In his Sermon on the Trinity, fol. 265 A, it is said: "What is the language of God? the Father beholding himself with a simple knowledge, and looking into the simple purity of his nature, sees all creatures formed, and speaks within himself; that Word is a clear knowledge, and that is the Son; therefore the phrase "God speaks," is equivalent to "God begets." For other passages, comp. *Schmidt*, l. c. p. 696.—*H. Suso* taught as follows (c. 55, see *Diepenbrock*, p. 215): "In proportion as any being is simple in itself, it is manifold in its powers and capacities. That which has nothing, can give nothing; that which has much, can give much. God possesses the fulness of all that is perfect in himself, but, because his goodness is unlimited and higher than the heavens, he will not keep it all to himself, but he delights in sharing it between himself and others. On this account the first and highest act of the manifestation of the summum bonum must have reference to itself, and that cannot be, except it be present, inward, substantial, personal, natural, necessary without being compulsory, infinite and perfect. All other manifestations which are in time or in created objects, are only the reflection of the eternal manifestation of the unlimited Divine goodness. Therefore the schoolmen say, that in the emanation of the creature from the first origin there is a circular return of the end into the commencement: for as the procession of the person from God is a complete image of the origin of the creature, so it is also a type of the return of the creature into

God. Now observe the difference between the said manifestation, and the manifestation of God. . . . . A human father gives to his son in his birth a part of his own nature, but not all at once, and not the whole of that which he is; for he himself is a compound being. But as it is evident that the Divine manifestation is so much more intimate and dignified according to the dignity of the person, and as God infinitely surpasses all other beings, it necessarily follows that his manifestation is equal to his nature, and that such a manifestation cannot take place apart from a manifestation of his nature according to personal qualities. If you can now contemplate with a pure eye, and behold the purest goodness of the highest good, which is in its very nature a beginning which operates in the present time, and loves itself naturally and willingly; then you will see the exceeding supernatural manifestation of the Word from the Father, by whose words all things were created and formed, and you will perceive in the highest good, and in the highest manifestation, the necessary origin of the Holy Trinity: Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. And as the highest manifestation proceeds from the supreme and essential Godhead, there must be in the said Trinity the most perfect and most intimate sameness of essence, the highest equality and independence of being which the three persons possess in triumphant manifestation, in undivided substance and in the undivided omnipotence of the three persons in the Deity." (Suso, however, acknowledged that none could explain in words how the Trinity of the Divine persons could exist in the unity of being. Ibid. p. 217.) Similar views were entertained by *Ruysbroek*, whose opinions concerning the Trinity are given in the work of *Engelhardt*, p. 174—177. According to Ruysbroek, there are four unfathomable qualities in God. He manifests himself through wisdom and love, he attracts by unity and substantiality. The eternal truth is begotten from the Father, the eternal love proceeds from the Father and the Son. These are the two emanating attributes of God. The unity of the Divine nature attracts the three persons by the bonds of love, and the Divine wisdom unfolds the unity with a tranquil and happy embrace of love. These are the attractive attributes of God.

(11) *Hugo of St Victor* found in *external nature* an indication of the Trinity. He perceived a still purer impression of it in the *rational* creation, viz. the *spirit*, which is only assisted by

the external world, or the world of bodies; in the one case we have a true impression, in the other only a sign. How the Trinity manifests itself in the external creation, (power, wisdom, and goodness), he showed in his treatise: de tribus diebus, T. i. fol. 24—33. Comp. de sacram. Lib. i. P. iii. c. 28. *Liebner*, p. 375. Concerning his philosophical views, Hugo followed his predecessors Augustine and Anselm, but employed that fuller and more poetical style which is peculiar to the mystics; he did so especially in his treatise: de tribus diebus. On the whole, Hugo differed from Anselm "*by remaining at a certain distance, and thus keeping to more general and indefinite expressions, in the use of which he exposed himself to less danger.*" *Liebner*, p. 381. We may notice as very remarkable, and foreign to the general spirit of mysticism, but as truly scholastic, the manner in which Hugo answered the question, *why* the Sacred Scriptures[a] have ascribed power in particular to the Father, wisdom to the Son, and love to the Holy Spirit, since power, wisdom, and love belong equally and essentially to all the three, and are eternal. He argued as follows: "When men heard of the Father and Son being in God, they might, in accordance with human relations, think of the Father as old and aged, and consequently weaker than the Son, but of the Son as juvenile and unexperienced, and therefore less wise than the Father. To prevent any such mistake, Scripture has wisely and cautiously ascribed power to the Father and wisdom to the Son. Likewise men hearing of God the Holy Spirit (Spiritus) might think of him as a snorting [Germ. schnaubend] and haughty being, and be terrified at his supposed harshness and cruelty. But then Scripture coming in and calling the Holy Ghost loving and mild, tranquillized them," (de sacram. c. 26) The passage is cited by Liebner, p. 381 and 382, where further particulars may be compared. Hugo, however, rejected, generally speaking, all subtile questions, and had a clear insight into the figurative language of Scripture. Nor did *Richard of St Victor* indulge so much in subtile speculations in his work: de trinitate, as most other scholastics. It is true, he adopted the same views concerning the trias of power, wisdom, and love, but he laid most stress upon the latter, and ascribed to it the generation of the Son. In the highest good there is the fulness and perfection of goodness, and consequently the highest love; for there is nothing more perfect than love. But love (amor), in order to be charity (charitas), must have for its object, not itself, but something else. Hence where there is no plurality of persons, there can be no charity. Love towards creatures is not sufficient, for God can only love what is worthy of the *highest* love. The love of God to none but himself would not be the highest love; in order to render it such, it is necessary that it should be manifested towards a person who is Divine, etc. But even this is not yet the highest love. Love is social. Both persons (who love each other) wish a third person to be loved as much as they love each other, for it is a proof of weakness not to be willing to allow society in love. Therefore every two persons in the Trinity agree in loving a third one. The fulness of love also requires highest perfection, hence the three persons are equal. In the trinity there is neither a greater nor a less; two are not greater than one, three are not greater than two. This appears indeed incomprehensible, etc. Compare also the passage de Trin. i. 4, quoted by *Hase*, Dogmatik, p. 637, and especially *Engelhardt*, l. c. p. 108, ss.—The other scholastics who manifested a leaning to mysticism, argued in a similar way. Thus *Bonaventura*, Itiner. mentis c. 6. *Raimund of Sabunde*, c. 49. Compare also *Gerson*, Sermo i. in festo S. Trin. quoted by *Ch. Schmidt* p. 106.)

---

[a] It is scarcely necessary to observe that Scripture by no means sanctions such an arbitrary distribution of the Divine attributes among the three persons. With equal propriety, if not with more, the Son might have been called love, and the Spirit wisdom or power. It was only the tracing of the idea of the Logos to that of the Sophia in the Old Testament, and the predominant speculative tendency (according to which *intelligence* was the most important thing) which led to this kind of reasoning.

(12) *Savonarola* showed in a very ingenious manner (Triumphus crucis Lib. iii. c. 3, p. 192—96, quoted by *Rudelbach*, p. 366. 67). that a certain *procession* or *emanation* exists in all creatures. The more excellent and noble these creatures are, the more perfect the said procession is; the more perfect it is, the more internal. If you take fire and bring it into contact with wood, it kindles and assimilates it. But this procession is altogether external, for the power of the fire works only externally. If you take a plant, you will find that its vital power works internally, changing the moisture which it extracts from the ground into the substance of the plant, and producing the flower which

was internal. This procession is much more internal than that of fire; but it is not altogether internal, for it attracts moisture from without, and produces the flower externally, and though the flower is connected with the tree, yet the fruit is an external production, and separates itself from the tree.—The sensuous life is of a higher order. When I see a picture, a procession and emanation comes from the picture which produces an impression upon the eye; the eye presents the object in question to the imagination or to the memory; nevertheless the procession remains internal, though it comes from without. Intelligence is of a still higher order; a man having perceived something, forms in his inner mind an idea of it, and delights in its contemplation; this gives rise to a certain love which remains in the faculty of thinking. It may indeed be said that even in this case there is something external (the perception.) But from this highest and innermost procession we may draw such further inferences with regard to God, who unites in himself all perfection, that the Father, as it were, begets out of himself an idea which is his eternal Word (Logos), and that the love, which is the Holy Spirit, proceeds from the Father and the Son. This procession is the most perfect, because it does not come from without, but remains in God.[a] Comp. *Meier*, Savonarola, p. 248, ss.

(13) *Wessel* (de magnitudine Passionis, c. 74, p. 606, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 206.) expressed himself as follows: "In our inner man, who is created after the image of, and in resemblance to God, there is a certain trinity: understanding (mens), reason (intelligentia), and will (voluntas.) These three are equally sterile, inactive, and unoccupied, when they are alienated from their prototype. Our understanding without wisdom, is like the light without the eye, and what else is this wisdom but God the Father?[b] The Word (the Logos) is the law and the norm of our judgments, and teaches us to think of ourselves with humility according to the true wisdom. And the Spirit of

---

[a] But *Savonarola* also pointed out in very appropriate language the insufficiency of our ideas: "God treats us a mother treats her child. She does not say to him: Go, and do such and such a thing; but she accommodates herself to the capacity of the child, and makes her wishes known by abrupt words and by gestures. Thus God accommodates himself to our ideas." See *Rudelbach*, l. c. p. 369.

[b] He calls the *Father* Wisdom; the scholastics applied this term to the Son. Comp. note 11. a.

both, the Divine love, is the food of the will (Spiritus amborum, Deus charitas, lac est voluntati.)" The practical application followed by itself.

The *three persons* in the Trinity were in a peculiar way connected with *the developement of the history of the world.* According to *Hugo of St Victor*, (de tribus diebus, quoted by *Liebner*, p. 383, note), the day of fear commenced with the promulgation of the law given by the Father (power); the day of truth with the manifestation of the Son (wisdom), and the day of love with the effusion of the Holy Spirit (love). Thus there was a progressive developement of the times towards greater and greater light!—The mystico-pantheistic sects, on the other hand, interpreted these three periods according to their own notions, and in connection with millennarian hopes.

§ 171.

THE DOCTRINE OF CREATION, PROVIDENCE, AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.—THEODICY.

The pantheistic system of *John Scotus Erigena*,(1) found no imitators among the orthodox scholastics; they adhered rather to the idea of a creation out of nothing.(2) Later writers endeavoured to define this doctrine more precisely, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, as if *nothing* could have been the cause of existence.(3)—The Mosaic account of the creation was interpreted literally by some, and allegorically by others.(4) Even during the present period the opinion continued to prevail generally, that the world is a work of Divine goodness, and exists principally for the sake of man.(5) Though mysticism would easily induce its advocates to regard the independent appearance of the finite creature as separation from the Creator, and consequently as rebellion, and thus to represent creation as the work of Satan (after the manner of the Manichæans),(6) yet these pious thinkers were roused by the sight of the works of God to the utterance of beautiful and elevating expressions, and lost in wonder and adoration.(7) On the contrary, the schoolmen, fond as they were of vain and subtile investigation, indulged here also in absurd inquiries.(8)—Concerning the existence of evil in the world, the scholastics adopted for the most part the views of Augustine. Some (*e. g. Thomas Aquinas*) regarded evil as the absence of good, and as forming a necessary part of the finite world, retaining, however, the difference between moral evil and physical evil (the evil of guilt, and the evil of its punishment.)(9) Others adopted, with Chrysostom, the notion of a twofold Divine will, (voluntas antecedens et consequens.)(10)

---

(1) Comp. above § 165. 1, and de divina natura ii. c. 19, quoted by *Münscher*, ed. by von Cölln, p. 63.

(2) God is not only the former (factor), but the creator and author (creator) of matter. This was taught by *Hugo of St Victor* (Prolog. c. 1. Liebner, p. 355), and the same opinion was adopted by the other mystics. The advocates of Platonism alone returned to the notions of Origen.

(3) Thus *Alexander Hales* (Summa, P. ii. Quæst. 9, Membr. 10,) drew a distinction between a nihilum privativum and negativum; see on this point *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 61, 62.—*Thomas Aquinas* (Pars. i. Qu. 46, art. 2,) represented the doctrine of a creation out of nothing as an article of faith (credibile), but not as an object of knowledge and argumentation (non demonstrabile vel scibile), and expressed himself as follows. Qu. 45, art. 2: Quicunque facit aliquid ex aliquo, illud *ex quo* facit, præsupponitur actioni ejus et non producitur per ipsam actionem...........Si ergo Deus non ageret, nisi ex aliquo præsupposito, sequeretur quod illud præsuppositum non esset causatum ab ipso. Ostensum est autem supra, quod nihil potest esse in entibus nisi a Deo, qui est causa universalis totius Esse. Unde necesse est dicere quod Deus ex nihilo res in esse producit. Comp. *Cramer*, vii. p. 415, ss. *Baur*, Trinitätslehre ii. p. 716: "*The circumstance that Thomas considered God the first cause and type of all things, plainly shows that in his opinion the creation, which is designated creation out of nothing, was not a sudden transition from non-existence to existence.*" Quæst. 44, art. 2: Dicendum, quod Deus est prima

causa exemplaris omnium rerum...Ipse Deus est primum exemplar omnium. While Thomas and *Albertus Magnus* draw no distinct line of demarcation between the idea of emanation and that of creation (*Baur*, l. c. p. 723, ss.), *Scotus* adheres to the simple notion that God is the primum efficiens; nevertheless he distinguishes between esse existentiæ and esse essentiæ; but both cannot be separated in reality, and the latter presupposes the former, see lib. ii. dist. 1, qu. 2.

(4) Thus *Hugo of St. Victor* thought that the creation out of formless matter in six days might be literally interpreted. The Almighty might have made it differently; but it was in this way that he resolved to teach rational beings in a figure, how they are to be transformed from moral deformity into moral beauty.—In creating the light prior to all other works, he signified, that the works of darkness displeased him. The good and evil angels were separated at the same time, when light and darkness were separated. God did not separate light from darkness, till he saw that the former was good. In like manner, we should first of all examine, whether our light is good, and then we may proceed to a separation, etc. Observing that the phrase "and God saw that it was good," is wanting in reference to the work of the second day in the Mosaic account of the creation, he was induced to enter into further inquiries respecting the reason of this omission. He found it in the number two, which is an inauspicious number, because it denotes defection from the unity. Nor is it said in reference to the waters *above* the firmament, as it is done with regard to those *under* the firmament, that they were gathered together unto *one* place—because the love of God (the heavenly water) is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost. This love must expand itself and rise higher; but the waters under the firmament (the lower passions of the soul) must be kept together. Though fishes and birds are created out of the same *matter*, different places are assigned to them, which is a type of the elect and the reprobate, speaking of one and the same corrupt nature: Comp. *Liebner*, p. 256, 57.—Friar *Berthold* perceived in the works of the first three days of the creation, faith, hope, and love; see *Kling*, p. 462, 63.

(5) *Joh. Dam.* de fide orth. ii. 2, (after the example of Gregory of Nazianzum and Dionysius Areopagita:) Ἐπεὶ οὖν ὁ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ὑπεράγαθος Θεὸς οὐκ ἠρκέσθη τῇ ἑαυτοῦ θεωρίᾳ, ἀλλ' ὑπερβολῇ ἀγαθότητος

εὐδόκησε γενέσθαι τινὰ τὰ εὐεργετηθησόμενα, καὶ μεθέξοντα τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀγαθότητος, ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παράγει καὶ δημιουργεῖ τὰ σύμπαντα, ἀόρατά τε καὶ ὁρατὰ, καὶ τὸν ἐξ ὁρατοῦ καὶ ἀοράτου συγκείμενον ἄνθρωπον.—*Petr. Lomb.* Sententt. ii. Dist. i. C.: Dei tanta est bonitas, ut summe bonus beatitudinis suæ, qua æternaliter beatus est, alios velit esse participes, quoniam videt et communicari posse et minui omnino non posse. Illud ergo bonum quod ipse erat et quo beatus erat, *sola bonitate, non necessitate* aliis communicari voluit......Litt. D: Et quia non valet ejus beatitudinis particeps existere aliquis, nisi per intelligentiam (quæ quanto magis intelligitur, tanto plenius habetur): fecit Deus *rationalem creaturam,* quæ summum bonum intelligeret et intelligendo amaret et amando possideret ac possidendo frueretur......Litt. F.: Deus perfectus est et summa bonitate plenus, nec augeri potest nec minui. Quod ergo rationalis creatura facta est a Deo, referendum est ad creatoris bonitatem et ad creaturæ utilitatem. Comp. *Alan. ab Ins.* ii. 4, (quoted by *Pez,* Thes. i. p. 487, 88.—*Hugo of St. Victor* also said (quoted by *Liebner,* p. 357, 58): "The creation of the world had man, that of man had *God* for its object. The world should serve man, and man should serve God; but the service of the latter should be to his own advantage, inasmuch as he would find his happiness in it. For God, being all-sufficient to himself, nor standing in need of the services of any one, man has received both, *i. e.* all, viz. the good under him, and the good above him, the former to supply his necessities, the latter to constitute his happiness, the former for his benefit and use, the latter for his enjoyment and possession. Thus man, though created at a later period, was nevertheless the cause of all that was under him, and *hence* the high dignity of the human nature." *Thomas Aquinas* supposed God to have no other object than the communication of his own being, Summæ, P. i. Qu. 44, art. 4: Primo agenti, qui est agens tantum, non convenit agere propter acquisitionem alicujus finis: sed intendit solum communicare suam perfectionem, quæ est ejus bonitas. Et unaquæque creatura intendit consequi suam perfectionem, quæ est similitudo perfectionis et bonitatis divinæ. Sic ergo divina bonitatis est finis rerum omnium. Comp. *Cramer,* vii. p. 414, 15.

(6) According to the author of the work on German theology (cap. i. from the commencement) the ideas of being a creature, being created, being an ego, and self-existence, are synonymous with love of the world, love of the creature, self-love, self-will,

natural carnal sense, and carnal pleasure. The creature must depart, if God is to enter. He thinks it sinful "to esteem created things, and to look upon them as *something*, while they are in reality—*nothing*." Subsequently he admits, however, that those things have their existence only in God: "Out of that which is perfect, or without it, there is no true existence, but all is mere accident, or mere semblance and glitter, which is no true being, nor has it a true existence, like the brightness which proceeds from fire, or light, or the sun."—Some of the *heretical* sects of the middle ages entertained views on these points which bordered upon Manichæism. Thus *Berthold*, a Franciscan monk, said in a sermon (quoted by *Kling*, p. 305. *Wackernagel*, Lesebuch, i. Sp. 678): Some heretics believe and maintain that the devil created man, when our Lord created the soul in him. Comp. *Ermengardi* opusc. contra hæreticos, qui dicunt et credunt, mundum istum et omnia visibilia non esse a Deo facta, sed a Diabolo, edited by Gretser in Bibl. max. PP. T. xxiv. p. 1602. *Gieseler*, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, ii. § 82, note o.

(7) *Henry Suso* (c. 54, quoted by *Diepenbrock*, p. 208,) said: Now let us remain here for a while, and contemplate the high and excellent master in his works. Look above you and around you, look to the four quarters of the world, how wide and high the beautiful sky is in its rapid course, and how richly the master has adorned it with the seven planets, each of which, with the exception of the moon, is much larger than the earth, and how it is beautified by the innumerable multitude of the bright stars. O, how clearly and cheerfully the beautiful sun rises in the summer season, and how diligently he gives growth and blessings to the soil; how the leaves and the grass come forth, how the beautiful flowers smile, how the forest, and the heath, and the field resound with the sweet airs of the nightingale and other small birds, how all the animals which were shut up during the severe winter come forth and enjoy themselves, and propagate their species, how young and old manifest their joy in merry and gladsome utterances. *O, tender God! if thou art so loving in thy creatures, how beautiful and delightful must thou be in thyself!*—Look further, I pray you, and behold the four elements, earth, water, air, and fire, and all the wonderful things in them, the variety and diversity of men, quadrupeds, birds, fishes, and sea-monsters, all of which cry aloud and proclaim the

praise and honour of the boundless and infinite nature of God! Lord, who does preserve all this? who does feed it? Thou takest care of all, of every thing in its own way, of great and small, rich and poor, thou, O God! thou doest it, thou art indeed God!

(8) *John Damascenus* de fide orthod. ii. 5, ss. treated of the whole range of natural science (cosmography, astronomy, physics, geology, etc.), so far as it was known to him, in the section on creation. Most of the scholastics followed his example. Comp. *Cramer*, vii. p. 388, ss. But in introducing natural history into the province of dogmatic theology, writers thought themselves at liberty to circumscribe it by means of the doctrine of the church. Thus it happened that *e.g.* in the times of Boniface [Bishop of Mayence], the assertion of Virgilius, a priest, that there are *antipodes*, was considered heretical; see *Schröckh*, xix. p. 219, 220.—In reference to the work of creation it may further be asked, whether it is to be assigned only to *one* of the persons of the Trinity? The theologians of the present period adopted the opinion of the earlier church, that all the three persons participated in it; *Thomas Aquinas*, Qu. 45, art. 6. *Cramer*, vii. p. 416. This was, however, scarcely more than a speculative idea. The power of creating was supposed to be more particularly possessed by the Father, from the very reason that *power* was ascribed to him, though different expressions were used, *e. g.* in the hymn: Veni Creator Spiritus.

(9) *Anselm* himself taught that *this* world is the most perfect (omne quod est, recte est,) dial. de ver. c. 7; and *Abelard* agreed with what Plato asserted (in the Timæus:) Deum nullatenus mundum meliorem potuisse facere, quam fecerit (Introd. ad Theol. iii. c. 5, quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, ii. p. 70.) This assertion, however, met with opposition on the part of others. (Comp. § 167, note 7.) According to *Alexander Hales*, every individual possesses its own perfection, though it may appear imperfect if compared with the whole, see *Cramer* vii. p. 413. Concerning the nature of evil, *Thomas Aquinas* expressed himself quite in the sense of Augustine (Qu. 48, and 49): evil is not a thing which exists by itself, but the absence and want of good. Evil is moreover necessary to constitute a *difference of degrees;* the imperfection of individual things belongs even to the perfection of the world; Summa, P. i. Qu. 48, art. 2, quoted by *Münscher* von Cölln, p. 74. But Thomas well knew how to

make an exception in the case of moral evil: the latter is not only a defect, but the wicked are wanting something *which they should not be wanting;* therefore the idea of evil belongs more properly to the evil of guilt (malum culpæ,) than to the evil of punishment (malum pœnæ.) (Comp. Tertull. advers. Marc. ii. 14.)

(10) The scholastics commonly treated of the doctrine of *Providence* and of *Theodicy* in the chapter on Divine attributes, and on the Divine will in particular. According to *Hugo of St Victor*, the Divine providence itself is an attribute, viz. that attribute of God by which he takes care of all the works of his hands, abandons nothing that is his, and gives to every one his due. Both the actual existence of good, and the mode of its existence, depend on the *disposition* (dispositio) of God. It is not so with evil. Only the *mode* of its existence depends on God, but not its existence itself: for God does not do evil himself; but when evil is done, he overrules it (malum ordinabile est) de sacram. c. 19—21, quoted by *Liebner*, p. 366. *Cramer*, vii. p. 274, ss. On the ϑέλημα προηγούμενον, etc. comp. § 126, note 5, and *John Damasc.* de fide orthod. ii. 29. By the scholastics the ϑέλημα προηγούμενον was also called voluntas bene placiti, the ϑελ. ἑπόμενον (consequens) voluntas signi (expression of one's will.) Comp. *Liebner*, Hugo of St Victor, p. 386. *Peter Lomb.* Lib. i. Dist. 45, F. *Alex. Hales* Summa P. i. Qu. 36, Membr. 1. *Thomas Aquinas* both denies and admits that evil proceeds from God. Inasmuch as evil presupposes a defect, it cannot have its origin in God, for God is the highest perfection. But since it consists in the corruption of certain things, and this corruption in its turn forms a part of the perfect universe, it proceeds indeed from God ex consequenti and quasi per accidens. The theodicy of Thomas may be comprised in this proposition, Summa theol. P. i. Qu. 15, art. 3: Malum cognoscitur a Deo non per propriam rationem, sed per rationem boni. Comp. *Baur*, Trinitätslehre, ii. p. 734, ss.

§ 172.

THE ANGELS AND THE DEVIL.

John Damascenus and others(1) adhered to the classification of the angels established by Pseudo-Dionysius

(§ 131, note 8.) The council of the Lateran held A. D. 1215, under Pope Innocent III. pronounced as the doctrine of the church, that the angels are spiritual beings, and were created in a state of innocence.(2) But with regard to particular points, such as the nature and the offices of the angels, the relation in which they stood to God, the world, man, and the work of redemption, ample scope was left for poetical and imaginary speculations, which sometimes led to absurd and fanciful notions.(3) The idea of the devil formed a still more essential part of the popular creed of the Germanic nations, and was either connected in a somewhat awful manner with the belief in sorcery and witches, so common during the middle ages, or was treated with levity and humour, and brought out in legends and popular tales.(4) In the history of doctrines, the said vulgar and current notion of the devil is of as much importance as the theoretical systems of the schools, which were for the most part founded upon earlier definitions.(5) In the religious point of view it is of moment, that the devil can compel none to commit sin, while he himself is delivered up to eternal condemnation.(6) He, as well as his associates, the evil spirits, are conscious of their punishment, but take pleasure in the torments of the damned; this compensation, worthy of their devilish disposition, is all that they enjoy.(7)

(1) De fide orthod. ii. 3. Most of the scholastics adopted the said classification. Thus Hugo of St Victor mentioned and explained the orders and names of angels (according to Pseudo-Dionysius) only very briefly (de sacr. i. 5.), "*which is a proof of his good sense.*" (*Liebner*, p. 395.) Comp. Lomb. Sent. lib. ii. Dist. 9, A. Thom. Aquinas Summ. P. i. Qu. 108, quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 65.

(2) Conc. Lateran. iv. Can. i. Mansi T. xxii. p. 982, quoted by *Münscher* ed. by von Cölln, p. 65.

(3) Most of the scholastics adopted the opinion of Augustine, that the angels were created *with* all other creatures, and only in so far prior to them, as they surpass them in dignity. Thus

Hugo of St Victor (quoted by *Liebner* c. 28. and 29. p. 392), Alexander Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura, etc., quoted by *Cramer* vii. p. 426.—The angels are distinguished from the souls of men, 1. physically (they do not stand in absolute need of a body); 2. logically (they do not obtain knowledge by drawing conclusions); 3. metaphysically (they do not think by means of images, but by means of intuitive vision); 4. theologically (they cannot become either better or worse.) Alexander Hales however did not venture to make this last assertion boldly. The angels have their own faculty of perception (intellectum agentem et passibilem); their knowledge is either matutina (cognitio rerum in verbo) or vespertina (cognitio rerum in se), or, lastly, meridiana (aperta Dei visio.) Comp. *Bonaventura*, Compend. ii. 15. The knowledge of some angels, however, is more comprehensive than that of others. Some *e. g.* foreknew the mystery of the incarnation of Christ, which was unknown to others. The angels also have a language, not however a sensuous, but an intellectual one. They have moreover a space, *i. e.* they are not omnipresent like God, but move with immeasurable celerity from one place to another, and pervade all space more easily than man. It was also asked whether they could work miracles: whether one angel could exert any influence upon the will of another? etc. see *Cramer*, l. c. (The quotations are for the most part taken from Alexander Hales and Thomas Aquinas.) Peter Lombard and others also retained the idea of *guardian-angels*, see Sent. ii. Dist. ii. A. *quoted* by Münscher ed. by von Cölln p. 66. Some entertained the singular notion of a *hatred* on the part of the angels against sinners, of which *Berthold* spoke in one of his sermons, quoted by Kling p. 18, 20: They cry daily at the sight of sinners: Lord, let us kill them! But he appears and exhorts them to let the tares grow among the wheat. But the more intelligent scholastics did not enter into any further inquiries of this kind. Thus *Hugo of St Victor* said: "We walk among those things timidly, and, as it were, blindfolded, and we grope with the sense of our insignificant knowledge after the incomprehensible." *Liebner* p. 393. *Tauler* expressed himself in similar language (Sermon upon St Michael's day—vol. iii. p. 145): "With what words we may, and shall speak of these pure spirits, I do not know, for they have neither hands, nor feet, neither shape, nor form, nor matter, and what shall we say of a being which has none of these things, and which cannot be comprehended by our senses? *What* they are is a mystery to us; nor should this surprise us, for we do not know ourselves, viz., our spirit by which we are men, and from which we receive all the good we possess. How then could we know this exceeding great spirit, whose dignity far surpasses all dignity which the world may possess? *Therefore we speak of the works which they perform towards us, but not of their nature.*" Nevertheless Tauler followed the example of his contemporaries in adhering to the hierarchia cœlestis of Dionysius.

(4) "*It is somewhat remarkable, that the devil of the middle ages seems to have lost much of his terror and hideousness and to play rather the part of a cunning impostor, and merry fellow... more like a faun who excites laughter rather than fear.*" *Augusti*, Dogmengesch. p. 320. Comp. *Grimm* deutsche Mythologie p. 549, ss. *Hase*, Gnosis i. p. 263. *Koberstein*, Sage vom Wartburgkriege p. 67, 68. (The trials for witchcraft did not become general until the close of the present period, during the fifteenth century, from which time faith in the power of the devil became increasingly associated with all that is awful.)

(5) *Anselm* composed a separate treatise respecting the fall of the devil (de casu Diaboli), his leading idea cap. 4, is: Peccavit volendo aliquod commodum, quod nec habebat, nec tunc velle debuit, quod tamen ad augmentum beatitudinis esse ille poterat. ...Peccavit et volendo quod non debuit, et nolendo quod debuit, et palam est, quia non ideo voluit, quod volendo illam [justitiam] deseruit....At cum hoc voluit, quod Deus illum velle nolebat, voluit inordinate similis esse Deo quia propria voluntati, quæ nulli subdita fuit, voluit aliquid. Solius enim Dei esse debet, sic voluntate propria velle aliquid, ut superiorem non sequatur voluntatem. Non solum autem voluit esse æqualis Deo, quia præsumsit habere propriam voluntatem, sed etiam major voluit esse, volendo, quod Deus illum velle nolebat, quoniam voluntatem suam supra voluntatem Dei posuit. Most theologians still adhered to the opinion that *pride* was the principal cause. In accordance with Isa. xiv. 12, Satan was identified with Lucifer, and the latter name was from thenceforward constantly applied to the devil.[a] According to *Anselm* (or more correctly accord-

---

[a] *Bonavent.* compend. ii. 28: Dictus est autem Lucifer quia præ cæteris luxit, suæque pulchritudinis consideratio eum excœcavit. Among the earlier

ing to Augustine, Enchiridion c. 29) the fall of the devil was the cause of the creation of man, which was to be a kind of substitute, and for the purpose of supplying the deficiency in the number of the elect spirits (Cur Deus homo c. 16—18.) The same idea was entertained by *Hugo of St Victor*, though in a somewhat modified form; see *Liebner*, p. 395. According to *Alexander Hales* some fell from among all the different classes of angels, but the number of fallen angels is less than that of those who preserved their innocence. Neither the evil nor the good angels can perform miracles in the proper sense; the former may, however, exert some power over the corporeal world, though they cannot go so far (as popular superstition would have men believe), as to change men into other beings, *e. g.* wolves or birds; see *Cramer*, p. 44.

(6) Thomas Aquinas, i. Qu. 64. The power of Satan has been especially limited since the appearance of Christ, (comp. *Cramer*, p. 447.)—*Anselm* declared it impossible that the evil angels should finally be redeemed (as Origen supposed); Cur Deus homo ii. c. 21: Sicut enim homo non potuit reconciliari nisi per hominem Deum (see below § 179) qui mori posset.........ita angeli damnati non possunt salvari nisi per angelum Deum qui mori possit......Et sicut homo per alium hominem, qui non esset ejusdem generis, quamvis ejusdem esset naturæ, non debuit relevari, ita nullus angelus per alium angelum salvari debet, quamvis omnes sint unius naturæ, quoniam non sunt ejusdem generis sicut homines. Non enim sic sunt omnes angeli de uno angelo, quemadmodum omnes homines de uno homine. Hoc quoque removet eorum restaurationem, quia sicut ceciderunt nullo alio nocente, ut caderent, ita nullo alio adjuvante resurgere debant: quod est illis impossibile.

(7) Cramer, l. c. p. 448: "*They may indeed delight in the evil and mischief which they do to man, but this joy is a joy mixed with bitterness, and prepares for them a more painful punishment.*" According to *John Wessel*, (de magnit. pass. c. 38. p. 532, quoted by *Ullmann*, p. 236.) Satan, (or more correctly the dragon), finds his greatest unhappiness in the knowledge, that God is ever happy in himself.....His second misery

---

Fathers of the church, Eusebius was the only one who applied the appellation Lucifer to the Devil (demonstr. evang. iv. 9.) Neither Jerome nor Augustine ever did so. Comp. *Grimm* l. c. p. 550, note.

, to see in his own condition, and in the case of all others, hat the Lamb, as the victor, has received from God a name hich is above every name......His third misery is, that he him- elf, with all the host of the powers of darkness, has prepared his crown of victory for the Lamb."

END OF VOL. I.

J. THOMSON, PRINTER, MILNE SQUARE.

VENEMA'S INSTITUTES.

In 8vo. Price 8s. 6d. Cloth.

HERMANN VENEMA'S INSTITUTES OF THEOLGY,

TRANSLATED BY THE

REV. ALEXANDER W. BROWN,

MINISTER OF FREE ST BERNARD'S CHURCH, EDINBURGH.

This work was never published in the original language, and exists only in manuscript, which came into the possession of the Translator some few years ago. The Translator may be permitted to remark, that the peculiar views which the Author entertains on some points, attach only to those on which divines have agreed to differ, and that nothing will be met with in this volume to affect, except in the way of increase, the estimation in which he has uniformly been held as a learned divine, and a godly man.

SCHLIERMACHER.

In Post 8vo.

BRIEF OUTLINE

OF THE

STUDY OF THEOLOGY,

BY THE LATE DR. F. SCHLIERMACHER,

TO WHICH ARE PREFIXED,

REMINISCENCES OF SCHLIERMACHER,

BY DR. F. A. LÜCKE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN,

BY THE REV. WILLIAM FARRER, L.L.B.

Preparing for Publication,

A TRANSLATION

OF

7505

J. A. BENGEL'S

R

GNOMON NOVI TESTAMENTI,

BY THE

REV. PETER HOLMES, M.A., F.R.S.A. OXON.

S0-AUM-396